



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

THE ECONOMIC REVIEW

VOLUME IV

THE
ECONOMIC REVIEW
73651

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

FOR THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY BRANCH OF
THE CHRISTIAN SOCIAL UNION

EDITORS

REV. J. CARTER
REV. L. R. PHELPS
REV. H. RASHDALL

VOLUME IV

London
RIVINGTON, PERCIVAL & CO.

1894

INDEX

ARTICLES

	PAGE
ANON. Three Months in the London Milk Trade	177
——. Tricks with Textiles	318
——. Adulterations in Groceries	490
BALL, SIDNEY. Socialism according to Bebel	229
——. Nicholson's "Principles of Political Economy"	526
BARNETT, Rev. Canon S. A. Christianity and the Charity Organization Society	189
BOULTON, S. B. Commercial Morality : a Vindication	208
BUSHILL, T. W. The Proposed Industrial Union of Employers and Employed	195
CARTER, Rev. J. Commercial Morality: a Rejoinder	221
CHADBURN, JAMES. The Coal War : Lancashire	80
COCKSHOTT, J. J. Compensation and the Licensing Question .	463
CUNNINGHAM, Rev. Prof. W. Economists as Mischief-Makers .	1
DURHAM, Rt. Rev. Lord Bishop of. The Co-operative Ideal. .	449
GENT, Rev. GEORGE W. The Church and her Elementary Schools	353
GRIER, Rev. Preb. R. M. The Coal War : Cannock Chase . .	68
HALSTEAD, ROBERT. The Stress of Competition from the Work- man's Point of View	43
LAW, ALICE. Town Life in the Fifteenth Century	375
LESTER, Ven. Archdeacon G. M. L. Wage-earners in Western Queensland	345
LUDLOW, J. M. Some of the Christian Socialists of 1848 and the Following Years (II.)	24
——. Two Dialogues on Socialism	328
MCDONNELL, W. D. Prediction as a Test in Political Economy	477
PHELPS, Rev. L. R. The Plea for a Living Wage	519
RELTON, Rev. FREDERIC. Two Views of Social Progress . . .	499
ROBERTS, CHARLES. European Militarism and an Alternative .	87
TALBOT, Rev. E. S. Moral Threads in Social Webs	153
VIVIAN, HENRY. The Co-partnership of Labour	297

	PAGE
WELLS, J. Working Men's Clubs	59
WILLIAMS, ANEURIN. The Co-partnership of Labour	297
WOLFF, HENRY W. A Defence against "Sweating"	166
——. Co-operative Credit	366

REPORTS ON LEGISLATION, ETC.

Legislation, Parliamentary Inquiries, and Official Returns.	
EDWIN CANNAN	117, 264, 406, 547

REVIEWS AND SHORT NOTICES

BALMFORTH, RAMSDEN. The New Reformation. <i>E. A. Pearson</i>	150
BAX, E. BELFORT. Socialism : its Growth and Outcome. <i>F. M. Butlin</i>	291
BELLIS, LUIGI DE. Guerra al Pregiudizio. <i>T. C. Snow</i>	583
BOOTH, CHARLES. The Aged Poor. <i>L. R. Phelps</i>	417
BORGEAUD, CHARLES. The Rise of Modern Democracy. <i>C. G. Robertson</i>	430
BOSANQUET, BERNARD. The Civilization of Christendom. <i>R. L. Ottley</i>	140
BOWLEY, ARTHUR L. England's Foreign Trade in the Nineteenth Century	296
BRYAN, ENOCH A. The Mark in Europe and America.	151
BUCHENBERGER, ADOLF. Agrarwesen und Agrarpolitik. <i>Henry W. Wolff</i>	139
CASARETTO, P. F. Influenza Reciproche tra movimento Operaio Produzione E. Richezza. <i>T. C. Snow</i>	580
COMMONS, J. R. The Distribution of Wealth. <i>P. F. Willert</i>	421
COSSA, LUIGI. An Introduction to the Study of Political Economy. <i>Sidney Ball</i>	559
CREPAZ, ADELE. The Emancipation of Women. <i>C. H. d'E. Leppington</i>	148
DODD, J. THEODORE. The Parish Councils Act Explained. <i>Edwin Cannan</i>	433
DRAGE, GEOFFREY. The Unemployed. <i>Edwin Cannan</i>	581
DUMAS, JACQUES. Le Problème Foncier en Angleterre. <i>G. W. Powers</i>	570
ELY, RICHARD T. Outlines of Economics. <i>D. J. Medley</i>	557
——. Socialism and Social Reform. <i>W. R. Inge</i>	567
Epileptic and Crippled, The	447

	PAGE
FLAIX, E. FOURNIER DE. Pendant une Mission en Russie. <i>Henry W. Wolff</i>	280
FRY, T. C. A Social Policy for the Church. <i>R. B. Rackham</i> .	145
GARNIER, R. M. History of the English Landed Interest. <i>D.</i> <i>J. Medley</i>	564
GIBBINS, H. DE B. English Commerce and Colonies	152
GIDE, CHARLES. Principes d'Économie Politique	151
GUYOT, YVES. The Tyranny of Socialism. <i>R. Marett</i> . . .	432
HÄNTSCHKE, H. Die Gewerblichen Produktiv-genossenschaften. <i>Henry W. Wolff</i>	584
HELM, ELIJAH. The Joint Standard. <i>Edwin Cannan</i> . . .	576
HOLYOAKE, G. J. The History of the Rochdale Pioneers. . .	445
HUGO, C. Handbuch des Socialismus. <i>J. A. Fallows</i>	442
Industries of Russia, The. <i>Edwin Cannan</i>	276
JAMES, C. A. Mining Royalties	447
JANNET, CLAUDIO. Le Capital, la Spéculation, et la Finance au XIX ^e Siècle. <i>W. K. Firminger</i>	435
KELTIE, J. S. The Statesman's Year-Book	446
KIDD, BENJAMIN. Social Evolution. <i>J. Wells</i>	419
LAMOND, ELIZABETH (Editor). A Discourse of the Common Weal of this Realm of England. <i>W. H. Frere</i>	147
London Statistics. <i>Edwin Cannan</i>	427
MACCUNN, JOHN. The Ethics of Citizenship. <i>H. Rashdall</i> .	586
MALLOCK, W. H. Labour, and the Popular Welfare. <i>R. Marett</i>	283
MAYET, P. Agricultural Insurance. <i>Edwin Cannan</i>	136
MOLINARI, G. DE. Science et Religion. <i>R. B. Rackham</i> . .	439
MORRIS, WILLIAM. Socialism : its Growth and Outcome. <i>F. M.</i> <i>Butlin</i>	291
MOSER, D. La Charge Financière des Caisses contre les Maladies	447
NICHOLSON, J. SHIELD. A Treatise on Money. <i>L. R. Phelps</i> .	273
OSTROGORSKI, M. The Rights of Women. <i>G. W. Powers</i> . .	293
PALGRAVE, R. H. INGLIS (Editor). Dictionary of Political Economy. <i>C. Gide</i>	134
RAE, JOHN. Eight Hours for Work. <i>R. Marett</i>	424
SCHÄFFLE, A. The Theory and Policy of Labour Protection .	295
SCHULZE-GÄVERNITZ, G. VON. Social Peace. <i>F. M. Butlin</i> . .	286
SIMCOX, E. J. Primitive Civilizations. <i>R. Marett</i>	566
SOLLY, HENRY. These Eighty Years	445
STEGMANN, C. Handbuch des Socialismus. <i>J. A. Fallows</i> . .	442
STEPHENS, HENRY C. Parochial Self-government in Rural Districts. <i>H. Rashdall</i>	142

	PAGE
STRAHAN, S. A. K. Suicide and Insanity	296
STUBBS, C. W. Christ and Economics. <i>H. Rashdall</i>	287
Towards Utopia. <i>T. C. Snow</i>	588
VAUGHAN, D. J. Questions of the Day. <i>W. R. Inge</i>	443
WILSON, G. R. Drunkenness. <i>J. O. Nash</i>	289
WORTHINGTON, T. L. The Dwellings of the People	446

NOTES AND MEMORANDA

Aquinas, Some Economic Doctrines of St. Thomas. <i>R. W. Carlyle</i>	113
Association Protestante pour l'Étude Pratique des Questions Sociales, L'. <i>E. R. Younghusband</i>	258
Building Societies Bills. <i>J. M. Ludlow</i>	393
Building Societies and Properties in Possession. <i>J. M. Ludlow</i>	396
Church Congress, 1893, The Birmingham. <i>W. K. Firminger</i>	109
Conciliation and Arbitration Board, The London. <i>G. W. Powers</i>	260
Co-operative Congress of 1894, The. <i>Henry Vivian</i>	389
Co-operative Societies in Germany. <i>Henry W. Wolff</i>	545
Dwellings of the Poor, The. <i>John Bullock</i>	543
Eight-Hours Day at the Salford Ironworks, The. <i>Edwin Cannan</i>	402
Friendly Societies for 1893, Report of the Chief Registrar of. <i>J. M. Ludlow</i>	541
"Labour Co-partnership." <i>J. M. Ludlow</i>	544
Labour Questions in South Africa. <i>V. T. Kirby</i>	111, 398
Law and Order Leagues in the United States of America. <i>G. Herbert Bolland</i>	244
"Living-in-System," A few Facts about the. <i>C. R. Fender</i>	246
Local Government in a Village, An Experiment in. <i>R. Ewing</i>	102
Municipal Family Home at Glasgow. <i>J. Wells</i>	397
Profit-sharing in Agriculture. <i>A. Leo Chipman</i>	104
Provident Collecting Banks. <i>Minna Mace</i>	538
Public Assistance to Agriculture in Switzerland. <i>R. v. Müller-Nixon</i>	255
Regulate Selling Prices, An Attempt to	401
South African Labour Commission, Report of the. <i>V. T. Kirby</i>	535
Trade Councils. <i>A. A. Roche</i>	261
"Tucker Village Settlements" in Victoria, The. <i>H. C. Hancock</i>	253

ECONOMISTS AS MISCHIEF-MAKERS.¹

IN commencing the work of another session, I have determined to make a beginning by speaking for a little about the blunders of economists. Those who recognize most clearly the advantage which may be derived from the careful and thorough study of economic phenomena, will be most ready to admit that there is a grave responsibility in connection with such investigations; that a mistaken opinion may be fraught with disastrous consequences, and that a little knowledge may be a very real danger, if it is over-valued. A word of caution about the special errors to which economists are most prone, will at least serve to reiterate, in another form, the point on which I have often insisted as to the necessity of carefully examining the ordinary methods of economic study. There is a disposition in some quarters to treat the discussion of this topic as idle and futile; I trust I may at least be able to make clear some of the reasons I have for regarding it as a matter of primary importance. I shall have to point out some serious blunders which were made, not by reckless or stupid men, but by first-rate students, and which arose, as it seems to me, from insufficient attention to the nature and limits of the method of study they were pursuing; they did not habitually ask themselves how far their reasonings were hypothetical, and how far they were dealing with actual phenomena. Only by keeping before us the precise nature of the instruments we use, can we hope to avoid the danger of falling into confusions that may possibly tend to bring about serious mischief.

I should be sorry if the effect of my endeavour to expose the besetting sins of economists were to make light of the whole study, as if it were in itself confused and worthless. I believe,

¹ Introductory lecture at King's College, London, October 13, 1893.

on the contrary, that very great progress has been made in the study of economics, during the last hundred and twenty years—and that on three sides: 1. In what I should call *pure science*—or *economic theory*—the analysis of such fundamental conceptions as *Exchange Value*. 2. In the working out of the hypothetical results of certain assumed conditions—*hypothetical reasoning of universal validity*. 3. In the investigation of the actual course of industry and trade, both in the past and in the present—*empirical study of economic phenomena*. These two last are closely connected together, as hypothesis is an important instrument of empirical study, but it is desirable, for clearness' sake, to specify them separately. All these three sides of study are important for the advancement of learning—none of them should be neglected by any student; and we may gladly recognize the advance which has been made on all three sides. But danger may arise through the inattentive pursuit of any of them; even in theory—in the analysis of economic conceptions—there has not been sufficient care to avoid terminology that had proved misleading or offensive. I am not thinking of cases where the persistent use of ambiguous phraseology has generated confusion in the minds of readers—though this has been common enough.¹ I am thinking of practical mischiefs in society, where the terminology or analysis of theorists has been taken up by the half-learned so as to sow dissension and breed class-hatred.

I. Even Adam Smith is not wholly innocent in this matter. Simon Gray protested against his use of the term “productive labour” on this very ground; he held that it would tend to make manual labourers think that men, who were not employed on tasks like their own, were merely useless.² There was something irritating in the phraseology of Senior and others when they dwelt on the “abstinence” exercised by capitalists; and the ordinary analysis of “rent” has served to foster in the popular mind a conception of the revenue derived from the soil, which does scant justice to the energy and care that has been exercised

¹ “Plea for Pure Science,” *Economic Review*, January, 1892.

² *Happiness of States*, p. 66. *All Classes Productive*, p. 229.

by English landlords.¹ I fully recognize the difficulty of finding suitable terminology, but it is none the less true that, whether through their misfortune or through lack of consideration, economists have, in the mere analysis of economic conceptions, been mischief-makers, who have tended to set class against class.

When I stigmatize these men as mischief-makers I do not, of course, intend for a moment to imply that they were deliberately or intentionally stirring up strife. It is just because I believe that their motives, in disseminating their views, were philanthropic, and that they were thoroughly in earnest in trying to use their influence for the national good, that it is worth while to call attention to the mischievous effects of their teaching. The deliberate wrongdoer, who makes mischief out of pure love of it, is a portent rather than a warning; it is only worth while to consider the incidental mischief wrought by conscientious and intelligent men. The evil may possibly have been, to some extent, inevitable; it was, as I believe, entirely unforeseen by those who brought it about, but it was none the less real.

II. Mere analysis, by economic theorists, has given rise to popular misconception, but far more serious evil has come about from the way in which students have pursued other lines of economic investigation. I wish to call attention principally to the rashness with which economists have applied their hypothetical reasonings to actual life, and to the carelessness of which they have been guilty in regard to the observation of facts. Economics is an important and advancing body of knowledge; but its progress has been delayed and its position discredited by the hasty and careless reasoning of some of its principal exponents. My complaint is not directed against economic science as such, but against men whose reasoning was scientific in form, but who were lacking in the scientific spirit. I would once more reiterate that, while I think it worth while to point out what seems to me to have been the sources of their errors, I do not wish for one moment to asperse their characters or to blame the men who made these most regrettable mistakes; I

¹ Duke of Argyll, *Unseen Foundations of Society*.

have no reason to suppose that in their place I should have been wiser.

There was, of course, a great temptation to fall into such mistakes when political economy was comparatively young, before the course of events had compelled its professors to modify or recast accepted doctrines. At the beginning of this century it seems to have been the general view among educated men, that, though Adam Smith's phraseology might be improved here and there, the substance of his teaching held good in even a wider sense than he had himself asserted. The praise which had been bestowed on him by Pitt, and the influence which the *Wealth of Nations* had exercised on English finance, seemed to raise his new doctrine at once to the position of an authoritative guide which responsible statesmen could not but follow. Just at this period, too, social and industrial questions were forcing themselves to the front, as they had not done since the reign of Elizabeth. The dearness of food caused terrible privations among the labouring population, the influence of machinery was beginning to make itself felt, and a considerable migration of employment had already occurred. Put in its general form, the question which the country had to face was this: Should the old system of regulation be modified so as to suit new circumstances and re-inforced, or should it be swept away altogether? The chief points on which the controversy turned were (1) as to the assessment of wages, and (2) as to the maintenance of a seven years' apprenticeship, as a necessary qualification for any one engaging in any of the old-established trades.

Looking back from this distance of time, we may perhaps agree that it would have been impracticable to enforce the old legislation exactly as it stood, and that some modification was necessary; indeed I believe this would have been readily admitted by the most strenuous advocates of the policy of retaining a system of regulation. But, in the light of subsequent events, I personally hold that it was most unfortunate that the whole business, of pronouncing on "a living wage"¹ and of

¹ I venture to substitute this short formula for the more cumbrous phraseology of the Elizabethan Act which was aimed at securing "to the hired person, both in

determining the qualifications of skilled workmen, was allowed to slip away from public authority and become a mere matter of contention between private individuals and private associations. The settlement of "a living wage" for different grades of labour, the discrimination as to who are qualified to do the work for which they are paid, and who are not, are matters of public importance: by refusing to deal with them, and by attempting to ignore them, Parliament has not set them at rest; it has merely handed over these delicate and difficult questions to be the occasion of continual and embittered industrial strife. And there certainly has been a considerable change of public opinion in this matter. The days when the most thorough-going individualism was in vogue were undoubtedly a time of terrible distress to the working classes. With the limitation of that thorough-going individualism, by the permission of combination among men and by limitations in the hours of work in factories, a great deal of improvement has come about. *Laissez faire*, pure and simple, has been tried and has been discarded; and not, as I believe, without sufficient reason. The evils of the earlier part of the century seem to me not merely to have synchronized with the period of unrestrained competition, but to have been directly induced by reckless competition.¹ On these grounds my personal prejudices are entirely with the men who urged that the sound policy for government was to modify and re-enforce the old system of regulation. Those who advocated a policy of *Laissez faire* pure and simple were, to my mind, not callous or cruel, but they were short-sighted; and, as I believe, that short-sightedness would have been less disastrous if they had been more imbued with a scientific spirit, and had better understood the limits of their own knowledge.

This preliminary statement may serve to set in clear light the nature of the charge which I have to make against economists of the period from 1795 to 1815. This was, as it seems to me, the critical period when our institutions were

the time of scarcity and in the time of plenty, a convenient proportion of wages" (5 Eliz., c. 4).

¹ I have argued in support of this opinion in my *Growth of Industry*, ii., p. 617.

consciously and deliberately altered. The great depression of trade after the war doubtless intensified the suffering during the succeeding decade; but I do not propose to describe the evils when they had become most apparent, or to say anything about the measures which have effected some degree of improvement. The repeal of the Combination Laws in 1824, the Factory Commission of 1833 and the resulting Acts, lie outside the scope of my remarks. I desire merely to point out the influence which economists exercised in sweeping away the old safeguards against the evils of reckless competition, without attempting to devise any other expedients which might supply a wholesome restraint.

1. As I have argued elsewhere,¹ I hold that the assessment of wages by public authority was never systematically carried out in this country; but the Elizabethan Act² which enjoined it, under severe penalties, was still one of the Statutes of the Realm: to what extent it may have exercised an indirect influence is a question of great difficulty, on which I do not now enter. But at any rate it was a dead letter in the latter part of the eighteenth century. During the greater part of that century, food had been plentiful and employment good; but towards its close there was a time of serious scarcity, when attention was drawn to the provisions of the Elizabethan Act, and earnest endeavours were made, in many quarters, to amend and re-enforce it, or to embody its principles in some new measure.³ Mr. Whitbread urged this course on more than one occasion in Parliament,⁴ and the policy was keenly debated in various quarters. There were grave practical difficulties in the way, however, and the pressing emergency appeared to have been met by other expedients, such as the *Allowance System*, and the *Cotton Arbitration Acts*; and there was no disposition in Parliament to return to the old principle as a means of alleviating distress among the cotton weavers in 1808.⁵ Under these circumstances, when Lord Sidmouth moved the repeal of the wages

¹ *Growth of English Industry*, ii., 199.

² 5 Eliz., c. 4.

³ *Growth of Industry*, ii., 470, 498.

⁴ *Parl. Hist.*, xxxii., 700. *Ibid.*, xxxiv., 1428.

⁵ *Parl. Debates*, xi., 426.

clauses in 1813 he felt that there was no need for him ¹ "to point out to the enlightened minds of their lordships the pernicious consequences which must result from the operation of Acts of this description." No member of Parliament seems to have spoken in defence of the system; but the arguments adduced against retaining this ancient policy were not based on any felt inconvenience, but merely on the principles of political economy. Pitt had appealed in 1796 to the Commons to "consider the operation of general principles and rely upon the effects of their unconfined exercise;" ² any measure for regulating wages was "highly improper," as it "went to introduce legislative interference into that which ought to be allowed invariably to take its natural course." ³ The doctrinaire character of the debate in 1808 was even more obvious. Mr. Rose, in introducing his bill, indicated his dissent from its principles, and excused himself on the ground that he was acting "in accordance with the wishes of the cotton weavers, backed with the consent of their employers." ⁴ Though a Committee of the House of Commons took evidence on the subject in 1809, their conclusion was a foregone affair from the first. ⁵ Nor were the politicians alone in thinking that they understood the true interests of the labourer better than either the employers or the hands, and that in refusing to adopt the course proposed they were saving them from themselves. The line they followed had the approval of the most learned economist and careful statistician of the day, who held that the true interest of a manufacturing community "can alone be effectually promoted by competition, which hinders the rise of wages among workmen, and promotes at once the goodness and the cheapness of the manufacture." ⁶

¹ *Parl. Debates*, xxv., 595. ² *Parl. Hist.*, xxxii., 707. ³ *Ibid.*, xxxiv., 1428.

⁴ *Parl. Debates*, xi., 426, 427. The attitude of the employers comes out very clearly in *Reports*, 1808, ii., 98, 108; also Petition in *C. J.*, lxiv., 95.

⁵ *Reports, etc.*, 1809, iii., 119.

⁶ Chalmers, *Estimate*, p. 37. Ricardo gave the sanction of his authority to this manner of dealing with the question when he spoke against any delay in the repeal of the Spitalfields Acts. "The principles of true political economy never changed, and those who did not understand that science had better say nothing

In deference to such high authorities, who thus laid down the principles of political economy, the whole system of wages assessment was swept away in 1813.¹ The House of Commons does not appear to have thought it necessary to make any further inquiry into the probable effect of their action on the one class in the community who addressed them on the subject. Petitions were sent from several centres in Lancashire, but the Bolton petition may be quoted at some length. It sets forth that—

“The petitioners are much concerned to learn that a bill has been brought into the house to repeal so much of the Statute 5 *Eliz.* as empowers and requires the magistrates, in their respective jurisdictions, to rate and settle the prices to be paid to labourers, handicrafts, spinners, weavers, etc., and that the petitioners have endured almost constant reductions in the prices of their labour for many years, with sometimes a trifling advance, but during the last thirty months they have continued, with very little alteration, so low, that the average wages of cotton weavers do not exceed 5s. per week, though other trades in general earn from 20s. to 30s. per week; and that the extravagant prices of provisions of all kinds render it impossible for the Petitioners to procure food for themselves and families, and the parishes are so burthened that an adequate supply cannot be had from that quarter; and that in the 40th year of His present Majesty, a Law was made to settle disputes between Masters and Workmen, which Law, having been found capable of evasion, and evaded, became unavailing; after which in 1802, 1803, and 1804, applications being made to amend that of the 40th, another Law was made varying in some points from the former, but this also is found unavailing, in as much as no one conviction before a Magistrate under this Law has ever been confirmed at any Quarter Sessions of the Peace; and that several applications have since been made to the House to enact such Laws as they would judge suitable to afford relief to the trade, in which Masters and Workmen have joined, but hitherto without any effect; and that, about twelve months since, it was found that the Statute of Elizabeth (if acted upon) was competent to afford the desired relief, and it was resorted to in certain cases, but the want of generality prevented its obtaining at that time, especially as it can be acted upon only at the Easter Quarter Sessions or six weeks thereafter; and about it, but endeavour to give good reasons, if they could find any, for supporting the existing act” (*Parl. Debates*, N.S. ix., 381. Compare Bonar, *Letters of Ricardo*, xi.).

¹ 53 Geo. III., c. 40.

that as Petitions to the Magistrates were almost general last Quarter Sessions, and all graciously received at each different jurisdiction, much hope was entertained that at the next Easter Sessions, the Magistrates would settle the wages of the Petitioners, and they obtain food by their industry ; and that the present Bill to repeal the aforesaid Law has sunk the spirits of the Petitioners beyond description, having no hope left ; the former laws made for their security being unavailing, there is no protection for their sole property, which is their labour ; and that, though the said law of 5 *Eliz.* was wisely designed to protect all trades and workmen, yet none will essentially suffer by its repeal save the Cotton Weavers ; the Silk Weavers have had Acts to secure their prices, as have other artisans. Tradesmen generally receive their contracted wages, but Cotton Weavers, when their work is done, know not what they shall receive, as that depends on the goodness of the employer's heart."¹

So far as the history of the repeal of these clauses can be traced, it does not appear that there was any demand for it, or that any petitions were presented in favour of repeal. The magistrates and weavers in Lancashire were anxious that the Act should remain, and the majority of the employers appear to have been favourable to some measure of the sort. The House of Commons was not moved by manufacturers or practical men of any sort : it seems to have been simply influenced by the exponents of the principles of Political Economy, who over-valued the reliability of the *laissez faire* doctrines on which they laid such stress.

2. The remainder of the Elizabethan Act, dealing with the term of apprenticeship, was repealed in the following year.² The story of the struggle on this subject, presents a curious contrast to the history of the repeal of the wages clauses ; but it illustrates the same point, for it shows the economists in the same light. So far as I can judge, the seven years' apprenticeship required by the Act had been enforced generally in England for two hundred years after the measure was passed. In London a precisely similar practice was enforced, not under the Act, but by the custom of the city ;³ and a similar arrangement appears

¹ *Commons Journals*, lxviii., 229.

² 54 Geo. III., cap. 96.

³ *Die Regelung des Lehrlingswesen in Z. f. Social und Wirthschaftsgeschichte*, i. 61.

to have become customary in some trades which were not regarded as under the Act at all—though this may possibly have been due to the indirect influence of the Act. At any rate, it may be said that, whereas the wages clauses were swept away as a mere dead letter, there seems to have been a feeling that the apprenticeship system was so firmly established¹ that it was unnecessary to strengthen it by legislative sanctions.

The matter appears to have been brought before the House of Commons at the instance of men who desired that the old law might be recast and more stringently enforced; but, on the other hand, the principle of the Act had been already set aside, first tentatively,² and then permanently,³ in the clothing trades. The partial migration of the industry had led to a disregard of the old rules both in Yorkshire and the west of England.⁴ Weaving could be learned perfectly in two years; and in the new centres of industry there was apparently a strong feeling that serious wrong would be done if the old rule were suddenly enforced, after it had been temporarily in abeyance, and if men who had proved good workmen were compelled to relinquish the trade which they practised, because they had not served their full time as apprentices.⁵ The laxity which had been permitted in the clothing trade was also the subject of complaint in other trades, and attempts had been made, with no great success, to prosecute masters who employed “illegal” workmen.⁶ Under these circumstances Parliament was petitioned to render the old system more effectual; but when the question had been once raised, it became clear that the House of Commons was in favour of settling it in another fashion. Still, no immediate action was taken; a select committee was appointed to take evidence,

¹ *Parl. Debates*, xxvii., 564.

² 53 Geo. III., 135, and continuing Acts.

³ 49 Geo. III., c. 109.

⁴ As well as a change in the conditions of trade and division of labour (*Commons Journals*, lviii., 75). The whole history of the conditions and recent and prospective changes in the woollen trades is admirably given in the *Reports of the Select Committee* in 1806. They held that the domestic system was so firmly established in Yorkshire that there was no danger of its being superseded even if the Act of apprenticeship were repealed (*Commons Journals*, lxi., 696).

⁵ *Reports*, 1802-3, v., 305. *Parl. Debates*, xxvii., 565.

⁶ *Reports*, 1812-13, iv., 991.

with the result that the chairman's view of the case was entirely altered: he had been in favour of sweeping away the legal enforcement of the apprenticeship system, but he was convinced by what he heard that this would be a serious wrong in all sorts of trade, that it would tend to a deterioration in the quality of goods, and to a lowering of the status of the workmen. Petitions in support of this opinion poured in from all parts of the country. But a mere mass of evidence had no chance of producing conviction in minds which were thoroughly imbued with a belief in the all-sufficiency of economic principles. Mr. Sergeant Onslow urged the repeal of the Act, and remarked that "the reign of Elizabeth, though glorious, was not one in which sound principles of commerce were known."¹ Mr. Philips, the member for Ilchester, was still more decided.

"The true principles of commerce," he said, "appeared at that time to be misunderstood, and the Act in question proved the truth of this assertion. The persons most competent to form regulations with respect to trade were the master manufacturers, whose interest it was to have goods of the best fabric, and no legislative enactment could ever effect so much in producing that result, as the merely leaving things to their own courses and operation."²

On this subject the politicians were only giving effect to the conclusions of economists of repute. Chalmers had been brief, but to the point.

"This law, as far as it requires apprenticeships, ought to be repealed, because its tendency is to abridge the liberty of the subject, and to prevent competition among workmen."³

Adam Smith, with his experience of the laxer Scottish usage, had condemned the English system,⁴ and it may be doubted if any of his followers, at the beginning of this century, would have dissented from his conclusion on this point. Once again *laissez faire*, pure and simple, triumphed through the influence of, and with the approval of economists, and the apprenticeship system was not modified, but swept away. The effects of the repeal

¹ *Parl. Debates*, xxvii., 564.

² *Ibid.*, 573.

³ Chalmers, *Estimate*.

⁴ *Wealth of Nations*.

were immediately felt in that industry where there was most need for regulating the conditions under which children were employed. The Apprentices Act of 1802 had been introduced by Sir Robert Peel with the special view of improving the condition of the children in cotton factories, many of whom were parish apprentices. But when the system of apprenticeship was attacked and discarded, the factory work was done by unapprenticed children, and the safeguards which had been provided by the Act of 1802 no longer operated.¹

3. Another case may be mentioned, where there is no direct proof of the influence of the economists, but where a disastrous step was taken which was in complete accord with the principles they successfully advocated. This was the passing of the *Combination Acts*.² The Act of 1799, which inflicted a new and very serious grievance on the artisan classes, appears to have been rushed through the House of Commons under the influence of a panic; its earlier stages were taken on three successive nights.³ There were no petitions in its favour, and there is no report of any debate in *Hansard*; it was not introduced because of pressure from the outside, but it was hurried on as a measure demanded by the Government. There is nothing to show why they were so eager about it, but a comparison of other bills passed at the same time renders it more than probable that the Combination Act was directed against any seditious conspiracies which might conceal themselves under the form of Trade Societies.⁴ The House of Commons was compliant, but things

¹ Compare Sir Robert Peel's evidence before the Select Committee of 1816. *Reports, etc.*, 1816, iii., 372.

² 39 Geo. III., c. 81; 40 Geo. III., c. 106.

³ 17, 18, 19 June, 1799. *Commons Journals*, liv.

⁴ The "Act for the more effectual suppression of societies established for seditious and treasonable purposes, and for better promoting treasonable and seditious practices" (39 Geo. III. c. 79) contains some curious provisions. All sorts of secret societies were to be put down, and regular lodges of Freemasons were only to be excepted if they complied with some rather onerous conditions. But clause fifteen is still more remarkable. "Whereas diverse places have of late been used for delivering lectures or discourses, and holding debates, which are not within the provisions of the Act passed in the thirty-sixth year of his Majesty's reign, for the more effectual preventing seditious meetings and assemblies, but which lectures, discourses, or debates have in many instances been of a seditious and immoral nature; and other

began to wear a different aspect when the measure was introduced into the House of Lords; the London artisans had come to hear of the bill which was being pushed on so fast, and the Calico Printers petitioned the Lords against it. Counsel was heard on their behalf, and the opponents of the measure thought it worth while to divide the House, though the Government carried the day. But the matter did not rest here. In the following year there were numerous petitions which came from all parts of the country for the repeal of the measure.¹ So far as I see, there was no expression of outside opinion in support of it; but though the measure was repealed and some facilities were given for arbitration in trade disputes, there was comparatively little real improvement in the new Act which was passed in 1800.

Though, as I believe, the Combination Act was forced through for a political object, and under the influence of panic, it is easy to see that the economists of the day were in complete accord with the principles which it embodied, in so far as they had an economic bearing. They distinctly preferred that each

places have of late been used for seditious and immoral purposes, under the pretence of being places of meeting for the purpose of reading books, pamphlets, newspapers or other publications; be it further enacted, That every house, room, field, or other place, at or in which any lectures or discourse shall be publicly delivered, or any public debate shall be had on any subject whatsoever, for the purpose of raising or collecting money, or by any ticket or token of any kind delivered in consideration of money or other valuable thing, or where any money or other valuable thing shall be received from any person admitted either under pretence of paying for any refreshment or other thing, or under any other pretence, or for any other cause, or by means of any device or contrivance whatever; and every house, room, or place, which shall be opened or used as a place of meeting for the purpose of reading books, pamphlets, newspapers or other publications . . . shall be deemed a disorderly house, etc." This curious clause was not repealed till 1867.

¹ *Commons Journals*, lv. 645. The London petition runs thus: "That during the last session, an Act passed to prevent unlawful Combination of Workmen, . . . and that the said Act by the use of such uncertain terms, and others of the same nature, has created new crimes of boundless extent, to which are affixed fines, forfeiture, and imprisonment; . . . and that, in many parts of the said Act, the law is materially changed to the great injury of all journeymen and workmen; and that, if it be not repealed, it will hereafter be dangerous for the petitioners to converse with one another, or even with their own families; and that its immediate tendency is to excite distrust and jealousy between the master and them, and to destroy the trades and manufactures it purports to protect."

labourer should be an isolated individual, with perfect economic freedom to make his bargain in his own way: this was a theory of society which was in accord with the measures against combinations that inflicted such terrible injustice as is revealed in the evidence brought before the Labour Commissioners in 1824. Adam Smith had mentioned combinations of workmen without serious disapproval, but this was one point on which his followers ventured to dissent from him. Mr. Philips, the member for Ilchester, proceeded to point out the evil effects which arose from—

“the system of combination among tradesmen, a system that had extended widely through the country, and had produced great violence and insubordination. That system was supported by contributions which were placed under the control of committees composed of idle and turbulent people, who willingly undertook the office, because they themselves benefited by it. Adam Smith thought that combinations among workmen were not dangerous, because they were counteracted by combinations among the master manufacturers, which he believed to be more frequent. That able writer was mistaken in the fact, and his reasoning was consequently erroneous. Masters, it was true, might have a common interest in reducing the rate of wages; but the opposition among them was so much greater and more powerful than that among the workmen, that it prevented them from frequently combining together. On the other hand, the journeyman drove the reluctant into combination through terror, and the apprehensive by the hope of protection and security which their greater numbers held out.”¹

But the attitude of economists towards combinations may be most easily gathered from noting the reasons adduced for repealing the Combination Act in 1824. They were repealed in the hope that, if they were no longer criminal associations, they might be less violent and, therefore, less powerful. Combinations were not even then viewed with any feeling but suspicion; though economists cherished the opinion that they might be permitted so long as the members did not resort to violence, inasmuch as they were powerless to attain their objects and raise wages. The committee, in reporting, remarked

¹ *Parl. Debates*, xxvii., 572.

that benefit societies had been made the cloak under which funds had been used for the support of combinations and strikes. They advised the repeal of the obnoxious measure, but seem to have had no idea of affording liberty to combine for the purpose of bargaining.¹

It would take too long if I attempted to dwell on illustrations of a different kind, and to pass from cases where positive mischief was done by ill-judged argument from the principles of Political Economy, to other instances when beneficial proposals were scouted and rejected. I will mention one. The present generation are eager to improve the condition of the agricultural labourer, and to provide him with an allotment; to give him, if possible, a certain independence, and, at any rate, to supply him with a fresh interest in life. So far as I see, the matter need not have been left to this generation. Practical men, like Arthur Young and Sir John Sinclair,² devoted an immense amount of attention to the subject, and discussed the questions as to the proper size of all allotments, under different circumstances of soil, etc., and the wisest conditions to impose so that pauperism might be checked. But the economists did not think it worth while to enter into such details; Malthus could apply the principle of population, and the younger Mill could demonstrate from the theory of wages that the whole attempt was illusory.³ There have rarely been men more keenly interested in the welfare of their fellow-men than were these two; yet even they, by hasty reasoning from hypothetical principles, brought their great reputations to bear so as to discredit and, perhaps, delay a most necessary reform.

III. It is surely needless to seek for any other instances of the mischief which able and philanthropic men may do, if they are not constantly alive to the limitations of the methods, and show themselves lacking in the scientific spirit. Even Malthus and Mill could forget the need of careful inquiry, and apply their hypothetical principles with undue haste. Those who honour their names most highly, and have learned most from

¹ *Reports*, 1824, v. 590. Compare also *Reports*, 1825, x. 6, 10.

² *Growth of Industry*, ii., 502.

³ *Principles*, II., xii., 4.

their teaching, will be ready to take warning from their very failings. In so far as the economists idealized an absolute individualism in industrial affairs, and induced Parliament to adopt a policy of *laissez faire*, pure and simple, they were responsible for the mischiefs which followed in its train. But some of those who feel very keenly the evils of the time of unfettered competition have been tempted to indulge in language that does not seem to me quite warranted by the facts of the case. It may suffice for us to recognize that the economists were in error; we need not assume that they were deliberately aiming at the evil results which came about from the measures they advocated. Yet this seems to be the view which is taken by Professor Marshall of the extreme advocates of *laissez faire*:—

“Among the bad results of the narrowness of the work of English economists early in the century, perhaps the most unfortunate was the opportunity which it gave to sciolists to quote and misapply economic dogmas. These dogmas were taken from their context and set up as universal and necessary truths; although a little care would often have discovered that they were originally put forward, not at all as independent truths, but as the outcome of particular illustrations of a scientific method of inquiry.”¹ “There were many hangers-on of the science who had no reverence for it, and used it simply as an engine for keeping the working classes in their place. Perhaps no other great school of thinkers has suffered so much from the way in which its hangers-on and parasites, professing to simplify economic doctrines, really enunciated them without the conditions required to make them true.”²

Professor Marshall never makes his charge definite.³ It appears that he was thinking of Miss Martineau,⁴ and Bastiat,⁵ but his sweeping accusation attributes mean and tyrannical

¹ *Pres. Pos.*, 19.

² *Principles*, 2nd edit., 61.

³ It is the indefiniteness of Professor Marshall's language that makes it a matter of complaint. It is, of course, possible that what he meant to say, with the reservations and qualifications in his own mind, may be amply justified. But a serious charge should surely be put in as definite a form as practicable, so that it may be possible to see at once, how far and of whom and in what place and time it is true; this seems to be specially desirable in the case of criticism of the dead, who are not able to reply for themselves, and may not always find champions to take up their cause.

⁴ *Principles*, 1st edit., 63.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 2nd edit., 62.

motives to men who argued as Pitt and Chalmers and Malthus had done. There is no attempt to specify a single case where this charge can be clearly established, and a mean motive is ascribed generally to those who employed reasoning which was widely current. It is surely more just to give the men of the by-gone generation the benefit of the doubt, as if they were mere ordinary criminals, and to suppose that they blundered in good faith, rather than arraign them for oppression and avarice which they carefully, and, as I think, honestly, disclaimed. Onslow, a leading champion of *laissez faire*, in arguing for the repeal of the apprenticeship clauses, said—

“If he had thought that the morals of the country could be endangered by the repeal, he would not have proposed it; he never could put any increase of national wealth in competition with national morals; but there never was a period when there was so little to dread on that subject,—never was there a time when so much pains were taken to diffuse religious instruction, and to promote education among the lower orders of society.”¹

While fully agreeing with Professor Marshall as to the baneful tendency of the writings of the uncompromising advocates of *laissez faire*, I prefer to regard them as honest and well-meaning men who were mistaken; I do not venture to stigmatize them as grossly careless or intentionally negligent of the well-being of the working classes.

IV. The full extent of the responsibility incurred by the doctrinaire economists for the period becomes most obvious when we note the attitude which was taken by the employers of labour. It may appear to some, perhaps, that the chief blame for the evils connected with the earlier period of the industrial revolution must lie, not with the *laissez faire* economists, but with the capitalists. If the economists used their influence to remove the safeguards of reckless competition, it seems at first sight as if the capitalists were greatly to blame for a selfish misuse of their new opportunities. Undoubtedly appearances are against them, for many of them became rich, while the condition of the labourer was deteriorating. And this

¹ *Parl. Debates*, xxvii., 565.

condemnatory opinion of the capitalists is adopted and stated with great force by Professor Marshall.

"It has been left for our own half century," he writes, "to understand fully the evils which arose from this sudden and violent increase of economic freedom. Now first are we getting to understand the extent to which the capitalist employer, untrained to his new duties, was tempted to subordinate the well-being of his workpeople to his own desire for gain; now first are we learning the importance of insisting that the rich have duties as well as rights in their individual and in their collective capacity."¹

But despite this forcible denunciation of the class, it does not seem to me that the last word has been said on the subject. It has yet to be proved that the employers of the war period were either (1) *guilty* or (2) *careless* in regard to the sufferings of the hands.

1. Three points may be taken into consideration before we endorse the sentence as to the guiltiness of the masters.

(a) It ought to be remembered that the rapid fluctuations of prices during the war—which were due, not to deliberate intention, but to unforeseen political complication—afforded exactly those conditions in which the enterprising capitalist had the opportunity of gaining largely, and that they also brought about fluctuations from which the labourer suffered severely. It is possible to account for large gains and terrible misery from the action of causes over which the employers had no control, and for which they were not responsible. We might blame them justly if it were shown that they made no attempt to alleviate such distress as far as they could, but this is a different thing from regarding them as either causing or aggravating the misery of others for the sake of personal gain.

¹ *Principles*, 2nd edit., 44. Compare also p. 43 for a description of the class. On the general question, I can only say that my impression as to the great improvement in the tone of society at large, since the time of the long war is not quite so roseate. It seems to me that the writers who contributed to the *Annals of Agriculture*, and the prominent men who formed themselves into a *Society for Bettering the Condition of the Poor* were actuated by a sense of the duties of the rich, individual and collective; and that the same spirit is abundantly shown in the deliberations on the great distress which took place in Parliament or among local magistrates. Philanthropy is not the special invention of our generation; it was in vogue before the days of the telephone and electric lighting.

(b) The worst evils of all at this time, and those which have left an indelible stain on the factory system of the day, were connected with the employment of very young children for very long hours. But even in this aspect it may be said that the factories did not introduce a new evil, but brought to light an evil that was widely current wherever children were employed, either by their parents or by other masters. It is unnecessary to allude to the horrors of the chimney-sweep's life; but it is worth while to remember that there was a strong case made out in 1816 for believing that the conditions of life of the factory child were preferable to those of the children who assisted hand-loom weavers in their homes.¹ So long as this is a question open to dispute, it may be said that even if the capitalists had not done anything to improve the position of a working child, they were not obviously guilty of rendering it harder.

There were, of course, bad masters as well as good; but when everything is taken into consideration—the worst oppressions in the small, badly managed mills, the overtime to make up for deficient water supply, the severity of the men whom the masters did not sufficiently control—it is difficult to maintain that the large fortunes of the period really arose from success in recklessly grinding the lives out of little children for the sake of increasing the profits on capital.

The medical evidence in 1816 laid special stress on the employment of children under ten years of age, and treated this as the chief evil for which a remedy should be found. But abundant evidence showed that the masters had no preference for taking these young children; they were partly forced upon them by parents who wished to secure their earnings as soon as might be,² and partly by the Poor Law authorities, who wished to save the rates by apprenticing them as early as possible. Mr. Dale, of the Blantyre Mills, which afterwards became so celebrated under the management of Mr. Robert

¹ There was some conflict of opinion, though it seems to me that the balance of evidence is on the side of those who thought the lot of the factory child preferable (*Reports*, 1816, iii., 290, 316, 354, 408. For an opinion in favour of domestic as compared with factory employment, see 390).

² *Reports*, 1816, iii., 288, 290, 297.

Owen, was forced to take children of seven from the poor-house in Edinburgh, though he would have preferred to have older children; but he could not get any at all, unless he took them at that early age.¹ For this—the greatest evil of all—it is surely unfair to fix the sole responsibility and the sole blame on the capitalists.

(c) It sometimes seems to be thought that the capitalists were guilty of using political influence, and inducing parliaments to pass measures in their interest and against that of the hands. This charge also seems unproven, for in so far as the suffering of the times was due to ill-considered legislation on *laissez faire* lines, it remains to be proved how far employers did or even could put much pressure on Parliament to carry out their views. They had little direct representation, and there is no proof that they took a decided stand in opposition to the policy advocated by the workmen, either in regard to Combination Laws, the Assessment of Wages, or the Elizabethan Apprenticeship Act. In regard to the Apprenticeship Act, hundreds of workmen would have suffered irreparably if a policy of rigid re-inforcement had triumphed, instead of one of repeal. Besides, in the first case where, so far as I see, the capitalists and labourers ranged themselves on opposite sides—the question whether the *Cotton Arbitration Act* should be amended or repealed,² the House of Commons did not show itself ready to adopt the line advocated by the capitalists; the law was not repealed as they desired, but after considerable inquiry it was amended in the hope that its object would be better attained; and there is no proof that at this time employers had the power, if they had the will, to induce Parliament to pass oppressive measures. The action of one factory owner at all events is worthy of notice in this connection. Sir Robert Peel found so much difficulty, in 1802, in securing that the parish apprentices in his own mills were properly cared for,³ that he introduced and carried through

¹ *Reports*, 1816, iii., 254.

² 39 and 40 Geo. III., c. 90. *Commons Journals*, Feb. 15, 1802; March, 21, 1803; June 15 and 16, 1803. *Reports*, 1802-3, viii., 889; 1803-4 iv., 211.

³ "I was induced, assisted by the first gentlemen in the country, to bring in a Bill about fourteen years ago in order to prevent these abuses; the House was so

a measure which had very distinct effects in improving the condition of factory apprentices generally.¹ Sir Robert Peel was a decided exponent of *laissez faire*,² but he was not such a blind adherent of the principle as to have any scruple about legislating on behalf of factory children, either in 1802 or in 1816. The legislative regulation of factories was pressed on the Government, not by outside philanthropists, but by a factory owner.

2. We may at least pause, in the face of these various considerations, before we condemn the employers as guilty; there is additional evidence which goes to show that some of them at least were not merely callous.

(a) We may first take the story of the cotton trade, at the time when the men were pressing for the enactment of a minimum wage. It appears from the evidence given before the Select Committee in 1808, that some of the masters were actively engaged in trying to obtain the legal enactment of a minimum wage. The majority of them were thought to be in favour of this policy, or ready to accept it, though some were anxious as to the method by which the minimum should be determined. Direct testimony in regard to a portion of the masters may be obtained from the statements made by the men; in 1809 several journeymen cotton weavers set forth in a petition to the House of Commons—

“that they are brought to great distress by the reduction of their wages; and that they do not obtain upon a fair average more than one-half the wages for their labour which they were paid in the year 1792, although, since that period, the charges for food, house-rent, firing, and other articles are nearly doubled and daily on the increase; and that a moderate advance of price for weaving would not prevent the

convinced of the necessity of the measure, that there was no difficulty in passing the Bill; I did it, not so much for the benefit of others, but, finding that my own mills were mismanaged, and that with my other pursuits I had not time to put them under proper regulation, I conceived I could not do better for the children than to bring forward that Bill” (*Reports*, 1816, iii., 372). There is no trace of any opposition on the part of the masters, either to the passing or enforcement of this measure. So far as any direct legislative action can be ascribed to an employer it is not one for giving more free play to the master, but for regulating the conditions of the children in the mills.

¹ 42 Geo. III., c. 73.

² *Parl. Debates*, xi., 462.

sale of a single piece ; and that the well-intentioned part of the Master Manufacturers have long lamented, and done their utmost to ameliorate the situation of the Petitioners by an advance of prices ; but, being incompetent to render such advances general, and having to dispose of their goods at one general market, they have been thwarted and disappointed in their benevolent design ; and praying that leave may be given to bring in a bill for fixing the lowest price to be paid for weaving the various species, fabrics, and textures in the Cotton Manufacture throughout Great Britain."

Even with all our growth in "earnestness" and "knowledge" I doubt if such language regarding even a section of their masters would be used now, by men in the direst extremity of suffering.¹

(b) The clothing trade was always regarded as exceptionally well-conducted, but a trifling piece of incidental evidence may be quoted about one of those enterprising manufacturers who were introducing the factory system and superseding the domestic system. Mr. Atkinson of Huddersfield explained to the committee, that within—

"his particular manufactory there may perhaps be one in five or six that have served a regular apprenticeship, because they make it a rule never to turn off any of their workmen, so long as they are capable of being employed in any way ; and they have perhaps one-fifth or one-sixth workmen who are very old ; excepting those he does not know that they have a single workman that has ever served a regular apprenticeship."²

I think this shows that even a pushing man, who was anxious for the repeal of restrictive laws, was not careless of the well-being of his hands.

Now, with this positive evidence before us, as to care and consideration, I think we ought to pause before we reiterate sweeping charges of callousness and greed. There were doubtless bad masters as well as good then, as there are to-day ; it is clear enough in the accounts of the treatment of apprentices : but I have never seen evidence adduced to show that the masters at the critical period were recklessly regardless of the well-being of the workmen, or used political influence to the disadvantage of their hands. I have looked for such cases ;

¹ *Commons Journals*, lxiv., 95.

² *Reports*, 1802-3, v. 308.

so far I have not found them. There is, to my mind, a decided contrast between the tone of the employers' evidence in the first decade of the century, and the language they used in 1824¹ or 1833. When the Combination Act had increased suspicion,² when *laissez faire* catchwords had come to be common property, when the struggle against depression of trade had become severe, and indignation at the excesses of the Luddites had rendered the mill-owners unsympathetic, there was callousness, perhaps, and bitterness. But that was at the beginning of the attempted remedies, not at the time when the mischief was done; of the alleged reckless self-interest in the first decade of the century, I cannot find the damnatory evidence I originally expected.

We live in days when industrial relations are much strained; when it is very hard for men to meet and settle their differences peaceably, and harder still to face one another, as they must do at times, and then to fight fairly and even chivalrously. Those who lightly use language which may serve to embitter feeling on either side, and give the dispute the aspect of an hereditary feud, incur a grave responsibility. Economists and capitalists have both been in fault at times—they have blundered; but it is a pity to represent either one or the other as conscious oppressors, until the charge is proved.

W. CUNNINGHAM.

¹ The increasing asperity on the part of the masters in 1825, may be gathered from the evidence of Mr. Oldfield, *Reports*, 1825, x., 121.

² *Reports*, 1824, v., 45, 52, 481.

SOME OF THE CHRISTIAN SOCIALISTS OF 1848 AND THE FOLLOWING YEARS.

II

THE next name I shall mention is that of one little known, and yet whose memory, for all who really knew him, must always be that of a genius the most original, of a nature the most lovable that they have ever been privileged to come across—Charles Blachford Mansfield. He was an old college friend of Kingsley's, whom I met at Kingsley's house the first time I went down to Eversley, and, after him, I may say, the first of the Christian Socialist converts. As early as April 12, 1848, you will find him mentioned in Kingsley's Life as one of those who were to write in the forthcoming penny paper, i.e. *Politics for the People*. Nothing could be more beautiful than the affection between Kingsley and Mansfield, nothing more judicious than Kingsley's dealings with him. The time is not yet come—if ever it does come—for telling the whole story of Charles Mansfield's strange, sad life, involved as it was in almost incredible moral complications, out of which he had only just shaken himself clear when death—a death which was in fact martyrdom—overtook him. Singularly handsome, with a smile of unspeakable sweetness, of an agile and well-knit frame, absolutely fearless, tender as a woman, he was at the same time one of the shrewdest and keenest of observers, and a thinker of singular depth, freshness, and power, whilst utterly unselfish, and morally incapable of anything that savoured of baseness or falsehood. He is the man I have loved best of any I have ever met in this life; and I believe a dozen other men must have said the same, so winning was his nature, and so many-sided.

I know this seems much to say of one who in his lifetime, beyond some scientific papers, published nothing but a few

articles in periodicals, whose posthumous works, besides that admirable account of Mr. Maurice's Bible-class which will be found in the latter's Life, consist of a volume of letters on *Paraguay, Brazil, and the Plate*, a *Theory of Salts*, and an unfinished work on *Aerial Navigation*; though the variety of the subjects may give some measure of the sweep of his thought. Yet he has left his mark on his century. Watching day by day for—if I recollect aright—ten months the boiling of a retort of tar, and noting all the products that successively disengaged themselves—he discovered the presence in tar of a product till then of most expensive preparation, but the cheapening of which, leading to the development of the so-called coal-tar dyes, has to a great extent revolutionized the art of dyeing. He virtually discovered that heroic little Paraguayan people, whose war against an empire and two republics awaits another Homer, which literally perished rather than yield, and whose cause was at bottom that of civilization itself, viz. that of the freedom of navigation of all great rivers. In his *Aerial Navigation*, Charles Mansfield laid down, I believe, the lines on which that great achievement of the future—perhaps brought centuries nearer by the liquefaction and solidification of air, as involving the promise that, sooner or later, man will be able to carry his atmosphere with him—will have to be worked out. But the subjects of his books are nothing in themselves compared with the thought which is constantly brimming over in them, and clothing itself often in words of striking eloquence. Take, for instance, a passage or two from his *Aerial Navigation*:

“How, then, can we procure mechanical power? Can we make it—originate it? Never. We can but catch the life-spirit as it thrills restlessly, profusely, regularly through the pulses of the universe, and direct it through the channels we can prepare for it. We ride upon a world which palpitates with power, swelling and sinking in eternal waves of Attraction and Repulsion, or rather of Condensation and Expansion. There are ceaseless tides of condensation and expansion in the life of things, which, taken either at flood or ebb, lead on to Power. The generation of power is as impossible as the creation of matter, is the same impossibility. Equally impossible is its extinction. Motion, however, may disappear. It may become latent, either being

converted into some other phase of force, as when we grind lightning out of whirling glass, or being stored up in a quiescent state for a time, as when we compress a spring. In either case we are but saving the force which the endless bounty of the Great Engineer supplies to us, and disposing it for a season as to us, or to Him, seems good. And the very force which we apply, whether of our steam-engine, or of our arms, whence comes it? From the fire or the flesh, not as from its fount or primordial source, but as from the terminal spout from which it flowed at last. It was stored up in the coal, and in the brain, as the result of the decomposing energies of ancient plant life, and of the upbuilding labours of the animal life of yesterday: each of these forces being but the ephemeral stages of the everlasting motion.

“We may then either clutch the forces of nature as they fly, and harness them to our machinery for instant service, or we may seize them and bind them in fetters to do our bidding at other time and place, or we may find them ready locked in matter, waiting for our touch to release them to their work. In our wind- and water-mills and sailing ships we ply the first; in our clocks and watches the second; in our furnaces the third manœuvre.¹

“There is no separation to be made between the natural and the artificial; the latter is but a particular case of the former. Nothing can be more false than the vulgar distinction between nature and art, and the pre-eminence in beauty and goodness usually assigned to the works of the former over those of the latter. This is, in fact, atheism under its most disgusting form—that of cant. It implies the belief that God does not work by man’s hands, though He does by wind and water. If there be any difference in degree, it must be that the works of human intellect are the more divine, as emanating from the highest of God’s creative tools—the human ‘beaver’ brain.”²

Surely it is impossible here to mistake the breadth of mind, the vivacity of thought of the writer; and scores of similar passages might be quoted.

The connection of the most patient observation with the most vivid and original imagination was a characteristic of Charles Mansfield’s genius. I used to say of him that if other people took hold of any subject by the head, he was sure to seize it by the tail. It was impossible to think or speak by rote, to follow any established routine, when you were with him. He had, of course, lots of what are called “crotchets.” He

¹ *Aerial Navigation*, pp. 465, 466.

² *Ibid.*, p. 466, note.

was a vegetarian—more, I believe, for economy's sake than for liking;—he had studied and practised mesmerism; and, as Kingsley states, in the beautiful notice of him prefixed to the *Paraguay*, had even gone into old magic:—all this in addition to his university and some medical training (he had walked the hospitals, as he told me, till he found there was no certainty in medicine as practised, and so gave it up). The result was an indescribable, unique combination of the most original thought with the most varied learning. There were times when inventions seemed simply to stream from his mind. Yet no one was less of a mere intellectualist; no one was ever more penetrated with what has been called in our days the “enthusiasm of humanity.” Kingsley speaks truly of the “voluntary penury,” when Mansfield “would subsist on the scantiest fare, at the cost of a few pence a day, bestowing his savings on the poor,” or, more properly, on any good work. In our Christian Socialist undertakings he was a most regular, most dependable, and at the same time most unobtrusive worker. No man ever shrank more from putting himself forward, except at the call of recognized duty. As far as I recollect, he never spoke in public, but when delivering lectures at the Royal Institution—one on benzole, and afterwards a series on the chemical elements. Yet latterly his power as a thinker was beginning to be felt. Faraday, himself one of the most genuine and single-hearted of men, was very fond of him; and I know it was expected at the Royal Institution that he would be Faraday's successor there.

But it was not to be. At the zenith of his genius God called him to Himself. And he gave away his life quite simply, as Kingsley relates, to save others. By the mistake of a servant, a still of naphtha boiled over and caught fire. He might easily have escaped; but he feared an explosion which might destroy the premises. He lifted the burning still in his arms to carry it out, but the door was shut; he tried to hurl it through the window, but it dropped from his poor burnt hands. Only then he scrambled out, all in flames, and, as there was snow on the ground, rolled himself in it to extinguish them; after which he

had yet to walk nearly a mile to a cab, leaning upon a woman's arm. He was taken to the Middlesex Hospital, where he was most carefully tended, and where relatives and friends took turns to watch him. He was never, I think, quite conscious, but perfectly gentle throughout, and during all his delirious agony never gave utterance to one harsh or evil word. Nothing could save him, and, to use Kingsley's words, "After nine days of fearful agony, he died."

One word more. You may be apt to think that there is friendly exaggeration in what Kingsley has said of Charles Mansfield—that he had "a superabundance of genial life, such as I who write have never beheld in any other man." One who never saw him, commissioned to write his life for the *Dictionary of National Biography*, after reading his writings, has, in speaking to myself, compared him for originality to Bacon. More could surely not be said.

As Kingsley brought Charles Mansfield into our movement, so Mansfield soon brought in his cousin, Archibald Mansfield Campbell—for all his friends, Archie Campbell. A few years younger than Charles Mansfield, Archie Campbell had in common with him—to begin with the lowest point of resemblance—his vegetarianism; his gentleness and sweetness of character, coupled with perfect courage; his transparent truthfulness; and all that goes to make up the thorough gentleman. He was a Scotchman—though without a tinge of Scotch accent, or scarcely of Scotch prejudice,—and could, as such, be occasionally hasty, though only for a moment, but otherwise was as a rule singularly patient under provocation. I remember once, when we were walking together, a big fellow came knocking against us, and then threatened us. I confess that the natural man within me resented the proceeding, but Archie Campbell, in the quietest of tones, said to me, "Don't pay any attention to him, the man is drunk." He was originally by profession an architect, and had a very true sense of beauty. Had he been able to continue in his profession—where advancement is terribly slow for those who are not backed by patronage—I believe he would surely have made his way to the front, but he married early, and, to

maintain his family, went off into business. His active fellowship with us belongs to the early years of the movement, the time of the Bible-readings, the night schools, the conferences with working men, and the first years of association. A few well-written articles in the *Christian Socialist*, under the initials A. M. C., were his only literary contributions.

In speaking of night schools, I must indeed guard myself from leading you to suppose that Campbell's work lay in our own night school in Little Ormond Yard. He was a devoted "Fonetic," and a regular subscriber to what used irreverently to be termed the "Fonetic Nuts." We were narrow-minded enough to decline the introduction of Fonetics into Little Ormond Yard. He thereupon transferred his energies to another night school, set up by other friends of ours, though not actually in our camp (my friend Robert Blachford Mansfield, Charles's younger brother, among others), in a place then strangely called "Of Alley" (I forget how it is now called), just south of the Strand, towards Charing Cross. I was present there one night as a visitor, when Archie Campbell was conducting his class. There came a bricklayer's labourer, a new pupil, who, when he was asked whether he could read, said he had learnt when he was young, but had forgotten all but a few letters. "My friend," said Archie Campbell, with intense conviction, "do you know why you have not been able to recollect what you had learnt? It is because the English language is so very badly spelt." That labourer's face was a study. He had obviously never dreamed until now, that his having forgotten his letters was any one's fault but his own. To be told that it was all the fault of the language itself, was quite bewildering.

I now come to another dear friend, and great friend also of Charles Mansfield's, Charles Robert Walsh, a surgeon, perhaps the sweetest tempered man I ever came across. I do not think I ever knew a man who could so thoroughly distinguish between the wrong and the wrong-doer; who could be so clear in discerning, so resolute and unflagging in opposing the one, so void of all bitterness towards the other. During the whole

of our intimacy I cannot recall having heard from him one angry or unkind word. In all discussions his part was always that of the reconciler, the deviser of some course of action which both parties might follow. He had been editor for several years of a medical paper, and contributed valuable articles on sanitary matters to the *Christian Socialist*. I am not sure that he had any great faith in curative medicine (perhaps Charles Mansfield, who lodged and boarded with him at one time, corrupted him in that respect), but he was a devoted sanitarian, in days when sanitary science had by no means the weight and importance which it has now. In the cholera epidemic of 1849, he accepted the post of inspector in one of the worst known districts, Bermondsey—losing thereby some of his best patients, old ladies who would not admit into their houses a medical man fresh from cholera patients and the slums,—and he discovered for us Jacob's Island, the field of a small sanitary campaign, which is referred to in Kingsley's *Life*. With Charles Mansfield and myself, he drew up the programme of a Health-League, which Mr. Maurice relentlessly crushed, as related in his *Life*, and I think rightly, as it would have been premature. Nevertheless, I stick to the view that the idea was a good one, and may perhaps yet deserve to be carried out, and I will therefore give here the programme, which has never yet been published:—



THE HEALTH-LEAGUE.

(OBJECTS.)

For uniting all classes of society in the promotion of the Public Health, and the removal of all causes of disease which unnecessarily abridge man's right to live ;

(MEANS OF ACTION.)

1. By collecting and diffusing information,
 2. By furthering the due execution, and where necessary, the amendment of the law,
 3. By stimulating and assisting all public bodies and private persons in the performance of their respective duties,
- In reference to the Public Health.

(MACHINERY.)

Through the means of local and district committees.

(TERMS OF ADMISSION.)

All persons may become members of the Health-League on payment of a yearly subscription of one shilling [and a penny] payable in advance.

Every member will receive a cheque ticket, which will entitle him to be present at all meetings of the League during the period of his subscription.

Subscribers of £1 and upwards are entitled to receive cheque-books of shilling tickets to the full amount of their subscriptions.

(MEETINGS.)

The meetings of the Health-League will take place weekly, and as far as possible in the evening.

In the first draft of the above programme, as penned by Charles Mansfield and myself, language a good deal stronger was used. But Walsh fought persistently till every harsh word was softened down. And any one who will look carefully into the language will see how strong it remains under its mildness. We had spoken of "punishment"—the idea is thoroughly covered by "due execution of the law." We had talked of "compulsion"—Walsh softened it into "stimulating and assisting;" and I can still see him chuckle as, in allusion to the Latin origin of the word, he indicated with his hand the application of the goad. Walsh afterwards became one of the most active members of the Council of the Metropolitan Sanitary Association; but he did not live many years. Not long before his death I remember his saying to me what a trial it was to find the time so short before one, just when one was beginning to see how to do many things which seemed impossible when

you first thought of them. When his last illness came, no man ever met death with a more sweet courage. He knew that his disease was mortal, and yet he spoke to me, a very few days before his death, with keen, I might say, buoyant interest of the observations which the medical men who were attending him were making on his complaint, as likely to benefit others.

From Walsh I will pass to the two cousins, Augustus A. Vansittart and Edward Vansittart Neale. The connection with both of them only began in 1850, after the establishment of the first Working Association, that of the tailors, had been decided on. I will speak first of the younger man. It was, I believe, a great misfortune for Augustus Vansittart to have been born rich. Had he had to work for his livelihood he would have been forced to get rid of those habits of procrastination and indecision which grew upon him more and more. He had excellent abilities, and when compelled to make up his mind could carry out a resolution with unswerving firmness; he was a thorough gentleman and a good fellow. In later life, when a great blow struck him, he went back to Cambridge, and devoted himself to university matters, making himself, I believe, most useful. He had a great deal of fun about him, and kept stored up in his memory the greatest number of false construes and scholastic blunders that I ever knew to remain in any man's brain, and, what is more, he had sorted these out, as it were, into genera and species. He was treasurer to our Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations, and stood once for Parliament. But he had a weak voice and a slow ineffective delivery, and was not a candidate to rouse his supporters to enthusiasm.

Vansittart Neale, many years older than Augustus Vansittart, was in many respects the very opposite to him. Augustus Vansittart was slow: he was exceptionally quick. The one was all hesitation, but, if deciding at all, deciding finally: the other most fertile in suggestions, and ready to modify as to make them, prompt to do and often prompt to undo. The one—not from stinginess but from caution—was generally reluctant to part

with his money: the other, while he had it, was lavish of it. The speech of the one was a drawl: that of the other, a torrent of shrillness. Perhaps I may sum up the contrast between them by saying that Augustus Vansittart had rather an old head on old shoulders; Vansittart Neale, on old shoulders, a rather young head. So much has been said lately of Vansittart Neale, especially by Judge Hughes in his two most interesting papers in the *Economic Review*, that I need not here dwell at length upon his character or life, although he is certainly one of the most prominent and interesting figures in the Christian Socialist movement. In, I say, rather than of it. He was Mr. Maurice's contemporary, not his disciple; he seldom cared to hear him preach, and in fact their theological views differed widely, those of Vansittart Neale being vague and lax. But if any man ever showed himself a Christian in his daily life, Vansittart Neale did so, in his latter years especially, when, as General Secretary to the Co-operative Union, he devoted his whole energies to the cause he had taken up. Naturally impatient and hasty, he had schooled himself to the most Christlike patience, enduring insult, bearing with the selfishness he always strenuously resisted, and so conquered distrust that I do not think any man was ever so widely loved and trusted by the working class as he had grown to be at the last. He was naturally a most acute, subtle, and even abstruse thinker. His book on *The Analogy of Thought and Nature* is one of the stiffest bits of reading I know—I do not pretend to have mastered it, nor do I know of any one who has. Yet the work of his later life was altogether practical, made up of small details; his dealings were with shrewd, hard-headed men, unmoved by abstractions, and he worked to a great extent single-handed as respects principles. The ancients held that "he whom the gods love dies young." The truth of the saying is deeper than they understood it to be, for they meant it only of youth as measured by years. He whom God loves dies young, whatever may be his age. And Vansittart Neale died young at eighty-two, with undimmed intellect, with sympathies undulled, working and planning for the improvement of his Bisham Abbey

estate, working and planning for the better government of the Co-operative movement, which he saw being deflected by its own prosperity from the pursuit of high aims, such as he had always set before himself. When we were working together, I not unfrequently felt called upon to oppose schemes which his then over-fertile brain and over-hasty judgment suggested. But a life of such generous, such utter self-devotion I have scarcely ever known.

I will only mention George E. Hughes, elder brother of Thomas Hughes, whose touching biography of him is, I trust, known to many of you, one of our later fellow-workers. Modest and retiring, he never took a prominent part in our work; but whatever he undertook to do was sure to be well done, and we all felt the goodness alike of his judgment and of his character. Alfred Nicholson, well known at that time as the first oboe-player of the day, a lovable and high-principled man, was debarred by the nature of his engagements from taking part in our active work, which had to be carried on in the evenings, but was thoroughly with us in spirit, and helped us indirectly in various ways. He astonished me, I may observe, by his account of the "sweating" of musicians at the hands of conductors.

But there is one more of our promoters whom I cannot pretermitt, as his position amongst us was quite unique,—Cuthbert E. Ellison. We had a nobleman among our number; but Ellison was our "swell." Very good looking, always faultlessly dressed, most courteous in manner, deliberate in speech, we were for the most part such a rough lot beside him, that it seemed quite a condescension for such a superior-looking being to take his seat in our midst. He was the only man I have ever known who took a positive pleasure in dress. Those, be it observed, were not the days of dirty, false colours, such as we now see around us, when nothing suits our diseased taste but what is dingy or faded—art, and especially fashion, reflecting faithfully much of the literature of the day, which takes pleasure in nothing that is not mixed with dirt. I remember a wonderful plum-coloured cravat he wore at one

time, and seeing him look at himself with it in the glass with visible delight. And yet it was not in him vanity or conceit, but a childlike pleasure in that which was beautiful. He had very good taste in art, was a very good sketcher, and, if he had been bred to the profession, would certainly have achieved success in it. Your interest in him will, I know, be excited when I say that he was the original of Arthur Pendennis.

For, indeed, when I first knew him he was member of a curious little community in the Temple, consisting of himself, Tom Taylor, his brother Arnold Taylor, and Thackeray, who for some time, as many may be aware, made so bad a thing of literature that he got called to the Bar, in order to get qualified for some appointment open to barristers of three or seven years' standing, and the four friends had found a set of chambers with two entrances, the one in Fig-tree Court (Tom Taylor afterwards wrote a farce under that name, in which he introduced both the chambers and the "Buster" to be presently noticed), the other in King's Bench Walk. The Fig-tree Court entrance was reserved as the professional one, and from it you entered an ordinary clerk's room, leading to an ordinary counsel's room, adorned only with a fair number of law books. But beyond this, again, was a large and perfectly ideal bachelors' sitting-room, looking out on Temple Gardens and the river, and approached by the King's Bench Walk entrance, with all manner of artistic sketches, furniture, pictures, smoking appliances, and general *bric-à-brac*, everything good of its kind. At the time I first knew the community, however, Thackeray—literature having begun to pay—was only represented by his name on the landing and his wig and gown. Truth to say, the only one of the four who had any business was Tom Taylor, who went circuit, and his was rapidly increasing, but he voluntarily threw up the Bar to become secretary to the General Board of Health. Ellison thereupon migrated to Lincoln's Inn, taking with him the so-called "boy," clerk to the community, who went by the name of the "Buster."

I think I may best indicate Ellison's position among us by saying that he represented the "Young England" element. When

he first joined us, a few of us were rather inclined to turn up our noses at him as being too much of a fine gentleman. But he was so thoroughly manly at bottom, so good a fellow, and so sweet tempered, that this feeling soon wore off. He was treasurer of an East End Needlewomen's Workshop, and never hesitated to go to Welclose Square on business relating to it. I have dined with him and others at an uncommonly bad Whitechapel cook-shop on our way to a trade-union meeting.

He had, while at college, been member of a set composed of men much richer than himself, and had been bosom friend of the Duke of Rutland, better known as Lord John Manners. Eventually, through the latter, he got a police magistrateship—I think, in the first instance, at Newcastle, serving afterwards at Manchester, and in one or two other places, till he worked his way up to London, where he died in harness. Without much law, he had very good sense, and a heart in the right place; and, whilst indulgent to error, he was thoroughly severe to humbug and rascality, so that he made an excellent magistrate. And he was really a very prince of good fellows, quite incapable of bearing malice. His smile was among the sunniest I have ever known.

I must now say something about a few of the working-men who became connected with us.

I cannot dwell upon Walter Cooper, the manager of our first association. I have no doubt that he was at one time sincere, honest, self-devoted; but at the last he passed out of sight, dishonest and disgraced.

Charles Sully, our first secretary, had been a book-binder, had worked in Paris, had joined the extreme party, fought behind the barricades in the revolution of 1848, and again in the insurrection of 1849—in the latter, as he has told me, till his arms were bloody to the elbows. And the result had been to convince him that physical force was not the means by which the working class could set their own condition right. So he separated himself from his old revolutionist allies, incurring thereby bitter hostility on their part. Spare, gaunt, hard-

featured, yet with a sweetness in his very rare smile, he certainly looked the revolutionist he had been. One peculiarity about him at that time was his hair, which stood up straight from his head like bristles or pins. There had been a domestic tragedy in his life—not the less real because a purely moral one—which, when we came to know of it, fully accounted for his hardness and occasional bitterness. I do not relate it, as there are one or two persons still living to whom the recital might give pain. He was recommended to us by one who had known him in France as able and trustworthy, and well acquainted with all the working societies of the day (not excluding, I may observe, Mormonism), and in all our dealings with him he thoroughly bore out the recommendation. He did not then profess to sympathize with our Christianity, though he respected it. Tract V., on Christian Socialism, containing the Constitution of the Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations, and model rules for associations, is substantially his. Circumstances, which I will not here relate, compelled us, however, to part with him.

He went for the second time to America, and found a very good place as manager to a large firm, occupying himself still actively with Co-operation. But after a few years he returned to England, finding it impossible, he said, in the United States, to bring up children as they should be brought up. I was able to find him a place in North Wales, looking after a slate quarry. And in the solitude of the Welsh hills his mind reverted to religious subjects. He questioned his own unbelief; opened a correspondence with Kingsley; and became by degrees a sincere Christian. As such he died at Liverpool some years later, respected by all who knew him. Under a rugged exterior he had a tender heart, and had always been one of the most truthful of men. Thus, though he was not a Christian Socialist whilst working in the service of Christian Socialists, he was one at the last, and as such belongs to my subject. I never knew a man upon whom one could more thoroughly rely for carrying out, with as much discretion as resolution, any duty which he might undertake.

One curious physical detail I must mention. I have said that,

in the days when he was our secretary, and openly professing not to be Christian, his hair stuck out straight from his head. That this was in nowise a result artificially produced I am convinced, from the sincerity of the man's character. What was my surprise, when I first saw him after he had become avowedly a Christian, to find that his hair now waved about his brows, softening marvellously his whole physiognomy.

Sully was succeeded in the secretaryship of the Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations by two friends, comparatively old allies of ours, having taken part in arranging for the holding of Mr. Maurice's first conferences with working men in 1849, Joseph Millbank and Thomas Shorter. I have hitherto avoided, as far as possible, speaking of living men, but in this case the two names are so joined together in the history of our movement that to dissociate them would make my story quite lop-sided as regards them. Millbank and Shorter had been fellow-apprentices in the watch-making trade as watch-case-finishers, the former in gold, the latter in silver, and had remained fast friends. Both were men of sterling honesty, high purpose; well-read, good speakers, Chartists. Beyond this they were most unlike. Millbank was physically keen sighted; Shorter's sight was very near and weak—he is now, alas, virtually blind. Millbank was quick and ready, and made the best of his gifts; Shorter was deliberate and retiring, though recognized among working men as the more long-headed of the two, as he was also the more remarkable speaker. Millbank, when he came to us, was a strong Congregationalist; Shorter's religious views were more vague and doubtful. They both rendered us very efficient service, and when Mr. Slaney's Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Savings and Investments of the Middle and Working Classes opened us a way to obtaining legal recognition for Co-operative associations, Millbank gave most effective evidence. At the close of the sitting at which Millbank had been examined, a banker M.P., who was throughout our ablest opponent on the Committee, took Millbank aside, and said to him, "Surely you are too clever a fellow to mean what you have been saying?" when Millbank had to

restate his views, and, as he told me, much more strongly, in order to convince the banker that he was really in earnest.

Whilst Shorter was unmarried, Millbank had a wife and five children. He found it impossible to earn enough money here, and determined to go out to Australia. But during the years that he had been with us, something had been working in the depths of his spirit. He had been in contact with Mr. Maurice; he had attended his Bible-class in the Hall of Association. In former days, although never professing to be a Baptist, he had felt scruples as to infant baptism, and had left his children unbaptized. Before going to Australia, he asked Mr. Maurice to baptize them. I was present on the occasion, and nothing could be more touching. He died in Australia some years afterwards, in communion with the Church of England.

I now come to the last, not the least, name of those which I meant to mention to you—Lloyd Jones.

At one of our early conferences with working men, there rose up to speak a man still young, with an intelligent face, and with a remarkable gift of easy, perspicuous, argumentative speech. He was evidently well-educated, professedly an Owenite Socialist, a master tailor in Oxford Street, and editor of a weekly paper called, if I recollect aright, the *Spirit of the Age*. After one of the conferences, Mr. Maurice took him home to tea. Friendly relations were opened up; and when the Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations was established, finding that he was willing to accept our principles, he became a member of the Council of Promoters. This was the beginning of life-long friendly relations between him and several of ourselves.

Lloyd Jones's family history was a singular one. He was descended—as related in the short memoir by his eldest son, prefixed to his *Life, Times, and Labours of Robert Owen*—from one Morgan Jones, a Glamorganshire man, who, having served as officer under William the Third, settled in Ireland after the battle of the Boyne. The family remained staunch Protestants till Lloyd Jones's father "went out" in the rebellion of 1798, and was in danger of his life. But the cruelties which he saw practised upon the Roman Catholics on the suppression of the

insurrection so worked upon him that, with a moral courage which was at least chivalrous if mistaken, he became a Roman Catholic himself, and, as if in defiance of Protestant supremacy, settled as a master fustian-cutter in Bardon, the Protestant stronghold of the south. Lloyd Jones was bred up to the trade, which used to be called "the gentleman's trade," as by three days' work one could earn enough for the whole week. He had a beautiful voice, which remained true and mellow till quite his old age, and had been a choir-boy in the Roman Catholic chapel, his father wishing him indeed to take orders. But whilst a boy, his faith in the virtual idolatry of the host which prevailed amongst Irish Roman Catholics was uprooted by an accident; later on, he became more and more sceptical, till, working in Dublin, he fell in with Robert Owen's writings, and threw off Romanism for ever. He was disowned by his father, came over to Liverpool, and, as he has told me, walked about for eighteen hours without touching a morsel of food, but succeeded in finding employment at his trade. He soon threw himself heart and soul into the Owenite Socialist movement, and, as he relates himself, set up with his friends a Co-operative store at Salford, which failed; then (in 1831) a free evening school, which was carried on for six years, and where he had his future wife for a pupil. In 1837, when a Central Board was established for the Owenite movement, he was one of the six directors. He took a prominent part in opposing the insane Chartist proposal which, even of late years, has cropped up again, for a so-called "sacred month" of universal cessation of labour. Yet, although the Owenites were the constant opponents of violence, it was used against them by Church-and-State mobs in various parts of the country, and at Bristol Lloyd Jones had to take refuge for his life in a police-station. It must be admitted that, after such experience, Lloyd Jones might feel a difficulty in joining Socialists who professed to be Christians. Yet nothing could be more straightforward than he was in all his relations towards us. In after life, it so happened that I was brought into close personal contact with him in several ways, and our friendship became always firmer and firmer. I never knew a man of more high purpose,

full of more genuine enthusiasm for the good. Of his ready self-sacrifice for a principle, I will only mention one instance. At the time of the breaking out of the American civil war, he occupied one of the most lucrative posts in provincial journalism—that of leading-article writer in the Glasgow paper of largest circulation. He threw it up—a married man with four children and no fortune—sooner than advocate the Southern cause, which the proprietors of the journal deemed—like Mr. Gladstone—to be the one likely to win. He was withal one of the most delightful of companions—full of varied experience, of good stories, bubbling over with fun. As a speaker of the argumentative type, I can only say that he recalled to me, but appeared to me to excel, Cobden, the greatest master in that line whom I have heard; and could he have entered Parliament, for which that style is especially suited, I believe he would have taken a very high place in it. As a journalist—I am only echoing here the voice of French journalists, who are good judges—he could hardly be surpassed. He had great literary taste—Wordsworth was, I believe, his favourite author of modern times; among older authors, he had a queer predilection for George Wither. Except for practical purposes, he had an almost singular indifference to contemporary literature. Yet he was a passionate book-lover, and a diligent haunter of book-stalls and second-hand book-shops. He had more than once collected a valuable library which, in the ups and downs of his life, had too often to be dispersed again, and of his qualifications for a genuine bibliomaniac I will only mention this—that he bought back again, after having sold it, a seventeenth-century book, simply because it was the longest epic in the English language. We often differed—I thought on several occasions that the course he took was a mistaken one,—but nothing ever dimmed our friendship. In his latter years he became a remarkable-looking figure. His hair remained abundant whilst turning to a silvery white, and his heavy white moustache gave him a soldierly air, so that he was often mistaken for a retired military officer. His voice retained to the last all its power and sweetness. He died of the fatigue and resulting illness

attendant upon a canvass for a north-country seat in Parliament at the age of seventy-five. Some time before, Lloyd Jones had told a clerical friend of his and mine, that before he came to us he had no religion; but that, through Mr. Maurice, he had become convinced that Jesus Christ was the Master of the hearts and consciences of men. At his death-bed, which more than one clergyman would have gladly attended, had he known of it, prayers from the Prayer-book were read by an old lay friend whom he had had fetched; and, though speechless already, with his lips the dying man followed the Lord's Prayer. Two or three days later his wife rejoined her life's companion. His four children—two sons and two daughters, all grown up—have for the last seven years been living together in the same house, in perfect harmony, each devoted to the others' interests. No better proof, I think, can be given of the spirit in which they had been brought up. But life, I fear, is for them a hard struggle.

I have now come to the end of this gallery of departed friends. And I will only add that I doubt if any collective effort for the improvement of society ever brought together men more various in their gifts and attainments—in two or three instances, of more commanding genius,—and withal more unselfish, more earnest, or more lovable than those I have mentioned as belonging to the Christian Socialist movement of 1848 and the following years. And I doubt whether there has been any such movement which, through seeming failure, has exercised a deeper or a wider influence over the nation in which it arose.

J. M. LUDLOW.

THE STRESS OF COMPETITION FROM THE WORKMAN'S POINT OF VIEW.

THE purpose of this paper is to give the writer's impressions as a workman as to how the stress of competition in trade and industry affects his own class. The paper makes no pretensions to be anything more than the recollections and opinions of one who, for a little over twenty-five years, has been in actual contact with some of the industrial problems the discussion and solution of which seem to form a prominent part of the work of the *Economic Review* and of the Christian Social Union. Among those who can contribute to a practical understanding of the pressing difficulties in which the industrial interests are involved, those taking an actual part in industrial work may perhaps hope to find a place. Cherishing such a hope, the writer has consented to contribute his mite towards the furtherance of this object.

To show that great pressure is being exerted on all forms of industry, scarcely needs more than a glance at the general state of trade and commerce. We see the fact fully borne out by the tension at which capital has to sustain its relations with labour; by the seething mass of discontent existing amongst all the labouring classes, in almost all civilized parts of the world, which the publication of the *Labour Gazette* has laid bare to public notice; by the definitely ascertainable amount of unemployed labour shown by the statistics of trades-unionism, and by a vaster mass of enforced idleness incapable of statistical presentation to the public. That this unrepresentable portion of the "unemployed" difficulty forms an important item in present-day labour problems, there can be little doubt. A walk through our large towns and larger villages will convince us

that the percentage of unemployed given by the published statistics falls considerably below the actual fact.

Without dwelling further on this aspect of the subject, the writer prefers now to give his experience as a workman respecting some of the special ways in which the stress of competition is felt amongst such classes of workmen as those whose fortunes he has had to share. His work has been, for the greater part of his life, that of a calico weaver. He began work in the cotton mill at the age of eight years, and has been in three different departments of the cotton industry. Beginning work at such an early age, he can testify to the evil effects of child-labour upon himself as to health, education, and moral life; but he can also see some serious difficulties about raising the age at which children are allowed to engage in mill work. The wages paid to a large mass of labour—determined, one may assume, by the stress of competition—are so low that even the mere pittance brought to the common family fund by the children can ill be spared. Free education will, in some small measure, relieve those who feel the greatest pressure on this account; but I have little doubt that some households are beginning to regard recent legislation with respect to the employment of children as a hardship and a grievance. If a workman could be guaranteed a livelihood better than mere subsistence, he would, in the majority of cases, be most unwilling that his child of tender years should be forced out of his or her warm quarters in the early morning, to face the keen biting wind or drifting snow, and walk a mile or two, and then work as if there were no such things as benumbed fingers, chattering teeth, and aching limbs. But so long as the exacting customer and fortune-building capitalism insist on labour being paid on the lowest possible scale, the workman will be obliged to use every legitimate expedient for keeping the wolf from the door.

There is another consideration bearing on this subject, and that is the necessity for an appropriate physical education, or an adaptation of physical organization for the kind of work that a person may reasonably expect will fall to his lot in life.

More and more workmen are realizing that mere physical dexterity and despatch are the prime requisites in efficient labour to-day. Side by side with the cry for technical instruction and a superior knowledge of his business on the part of the workman is the tendency of efficient machinery to take away almost all practical need for an intelligent interest in his work. The good workman of to-day is not necessarily the man who knows his business from A to Z, but the man who can bring himself with greatest readiness into the few simple mental and physical adjustments necessitated by a limited and mechanical routine of work: the workman becomes little more than a living portion of a complicated mechanism for producing a finished article. Ingenuity as applied to cotton manufacturing seems to have confined itself to the work of cheapening and increasing production. This has been done largely by increasing speed of machinery. To keep up with this increased speed we have had a larger tax put on our physical strength and dexterity. The sooner a person can be put under the conditions where the physical qualifications for working at such high pressure can be acquired, the more efficient, in the pushing business man's sense of the term, will that person be. I do not wish to be understood to advocate the sending of children to work at any age that would satisfy the pushing business man: I want simply to point out the effects of increasing stress of competition, in its bearing on some aspects of the educational movement. Working people, like the rest of mankind, have only a certain amount of energy available for all purposes, and in putting pressure on one side of their life, it would be wise to see what they have to bear on another. If the writer might be allowed to make a suggestion at all, it would be that an attempt should be made to divert the tendency towards mere increase of production into production of better quality at a lower pressure of work, to give the workman the chance of developing his intellect in relation to his work, and allow him sufficient time and reserve of physical energy for general culture. But perhaps this is only a Utopian suggestion for forcing on the millennium.

Another way in which the stress of competition affects the workman in the writer's sphere of labour is the attempt to cheapen production by adulterating the material with which he has to work. This affects the workman in two ways; viz. his health, and the quality of his work. In weaving most cotton goods some amount of size for strengthening the fibre of the cotton seems necessary; but this justification for some amount of adulteration has been used as an excuse for putting weight into the finished article. Some idea of the amount of size that a certain class of goods contain may be gathered from the fact that the finished cloth can be sold for less per pound than what was paid for the raw cotton. The writer has had to weave calico from material that carried twenty-four pounds to the score of adulterating materials, or 120 per cent. of size to the cotton. All this large quantity of size does not find its way into the cloth; a considerable amount is shaken from the cotton threads by the motion of the machinery, filling the room in which the workman has to carry on the business both of weaving and respiration with what, to those unaccustomed to it, is a very irritating form of dust. Imagine a keen frosty day—say it is Monday morning, just after the workman has had an extra breath of fresh air. He begins work at six a.m., the air in the loom-shed is beautifully clear. The machinery gets in motion, and before half an hour is over the room is filled with a white heavy dust, all the denser because of the dry clear atmosphere outside. With stinging nostrils and smarting throat the weaver has to toil, often enough with great exertion, in all this dust. Before the day is over a thick sediment covers all the machinery in the place. Some firms oblige their weavers to clear their machinery of this sediment by sweeping, which of course raises a denser cloud of dust in which they are forced to work. What an advantage it would be if the respiratory machinery of the workman could be subjected to a process of sweeping as well! Of the desirability of some such process one gets an idea from the loud, deep coughing heard from the weavers as they wend their way home through the biting frosty air at night. That such temporary protests of outraged nature are not the only

effects of this wretched business is shown by the prevalence of various pulmonary complaints amongst those occupied in this kind of industry. Consumption makes its ravages amongst the young, and bronchitis and asthma settle with all their chronic severity on the old.

This heavy sizing further affects the weaver by making his work much more difficult to manage. No device or skill of man can make a mixture of Epsom salts, zinc chloride, and china clay or kaolin into good weaving threads that will bear all the strain of machinery, and all other contingencies of weaving operations. But with a maximum amount of these and a minimum amount of cotton yarn the poor weaver is often expected to turn out a piece of cloth that will bear the unrelenting scrutiny of the master, or some one held responsible for such modernized attempts to make bricks without straw. There being such a small amount of fibrous material to give strength to the cotton threads, and such a large amount of size to give weight to the finished piece, while in dry weather the latter may be lost in the form of dust, some expedient for keeping the size on the threads is desirable. The device adopted for accomplishing this is to keep large quantities of steam floating about the weaving-shed, some of which is readily taken up by the "antiseptic" contained in the size. The steam helps to strengthen the cotton threads, making them tougher than they would otherwise be. It also adds weight to the cloth. As far as the work is concerned, the weaver gains an advantage from the use of this steam; but it seriously militates against his health. I have worked where one of these damp-diffusers was in vigorous operation, and know that almost all the work-people suffered more or less, and two of them have, to all appearance, been crippled for life with rheumatism after working at the mill for a few years. The new regulations as to this matter have, however, brought about some improvement in the steaming of weaving-sheds.¹

In judging of this state of affairs in connection with one branch

¹ Perhaps it is only right and pertinent to say that the writer is now a fustian weaver at the Hebden Bridge Co-operative Fustian Society, where the conditions for the workman are a decided improvement on what he has found elsewhere.

of our cotton industries, we are scarcely warranted in placing all the blame at the master's door; he has undoubtedly his own troubles to grapple with, and could not remedy some of the evils complained of, were he ever so willing. Perhaps the masters were to blame for introducing the custom of heavy sizing, though there does seem something to be said in reply to this. Customers have been known to prefer heavy-sized goods, not only for their cheapness, but because they looked better, knowing at the time that they were heavily sized. The custom having been introduced, it would be difficult for any individual master to hold his own should he attempt to reform matters. I have heard of firms which have tried what lighter sizing would do, and they have experienced the utmost difficulty in getting rid of their goods at remunerative prices. "We had rather work pure-sized goods," say the masters, "than heavy-sized ones, and if the market would demand such, our weaving-sheds would soon undergo a thorough reform." That the great desideratum in heavy sizing is weight seems borne out by a remark once made to a manufacturer of my own locality. "We must have weight," said a foreign merchant by way of protest in bargaining for goods—meaning, I suppose, that they were to be heavy and cheap. It is this demand for the cheap that has helped to bring about all these disreputable agencies for supplying the nasty. So long as human niggardliness will insist on driving hard bargains with a hampered business, human ingenuity will be on the alert for expedients for hoodwinking its grasping spirit with glitter that looks like gold. Some blame, no doubt, is to be attached to those who supply these cheap goods. Underselling and over-reaching have been some of the primary causes in driving our masters to such shifts for profit as I have attempted to describe. They have gone on the Exchange and cut each other's throats with low prices; and what could not be recouped out of reduced workman's wages, has had to be got from the use of worthless or inferior materials.

In a periodical of the nature of the *Economic Review* I presume it will not be out of place to discuss the effect of excessive competition on the character of those under its immediate and

direct influence. The importance of this is apparent when we consider how much control the labouring classes are getting over the industrial and political fortunes of our country. The main factors in a man's education are those influences with which he is in daily contact; and if our industrial life is to be carried on where cheating that is clever enough to evade the law, but obvious enough to the moral sense that has not been tampered with, has become an organized part of business, how can we expect working men to develop characters at utter variance with the largest part of their surroundings? That our business men are often hard-headed men—men of great practical capacity with a deft intellect for handling practical schemes with clearly defined practical ends, every one in contact with business life will be obliged to admit. The body of men who can not only conceive a Manchester Ship Canal, but can exercise sufficient speculative faith to invest large fortunes for giving practical effect to their conceptions, are evincing a strength and breadth of character that is worthy of admiration. The state of business that has brought such a gigantic scheme within the range of the practically possible speaks of an immense amount of energy and skill in creating and organizing business on such large dimensions. So great are the intricacies of business relations becoming, and so large is the field of their operation, that an intensity of practical faculty amounting to genius is necessary for a man of limited fortune to succeed. So great is the demand for adapting means to ends that men of more than average moral sensibility must often find their business life sustaining more or less strained relations with their own consciences. "If the Lord would let a man tell a lie in business now and then it would be a great advantage," said a business man some time since; and this is probably but the unspoken wish of many others. "I could not go on the Exchange if I made a distinct profession of Christianity," has been the admission of some who were at least too honest for hypocrisy. In speaking with thorough-going business men, one is often painfully struck with the amount of almost unconscious selfishness with which they look at the whole of life. Everything seems estimated in the terms of £. s. d. Life itself has been

resolved into a gigantic bargain, and even religion is considered mainly in the light of a spiritual contrivance for making the most of both worlds. I have discussed co-operative production with them, and found the utmost difficulty in getting them to see anything more in this economic scheme than a selfish monopoly. Their imagination has generally been unequal to conceiving of a body of purchasers who could be induced to act from any other motive than buying in the cheapest market. Business with them seems to have simplified itself into hard bargaining, where methods of production are considered entirely beside the mark. A business man declared on a public platform, and used what he said as an argument to back up a political party, that when he made a bargain it did not matter to him whether the man he bought from suffered or not, a bargain was a bargain. Application was made for some financial assistance from a firm in the north of England for one of their hands who had been in the service of the firm for forty years ; but the application was met by a reply as smart as it was cruel. To the man who had spent the best years of his life in helping to rear their fortunes the firm had nothing more respectful to say than that that was a place of business, and not a charitable institution.

It would be folly to suppose that our masters are more depraved than the average run of men would be subjected to the same influences. They are within the grip of highly complex forces arising out of the play of numerous and diverse human activities and needs, and probably they can no more control or resist them, and keep their business foothold, than the feverish patient can regulate his own circulation for the purpose of putting himself into a normal state of health. If they are to be extricated from the evil influences that are turning their characters into abnormal forms of mere acquisitiveness, it will have to be with the assistance of all who contribute their share of motives and actions that go to making up the conditions and influences that are making the life of the business man into one of industrial quirks and dodges, and robbing his character of its most generous and humane elements.

If those who are at the head of our industrial concerns suffer

in moral character through their business habits, with all their chances of contact with some of the higher influences of life, how much worse may we expect will be the case with those who are every day struggling with all the hard, exacting work, all the palpable dishonesty and brutalizing influences connected with the details of modern business! For people whose whole life is spent in the consciousness that there is but a narrow margin of chances between them and absolute want, or the workhouse, or the stinted charity of their fellow-workers, the stern necessity of providing for mere material needs becomes an overmastering moulder of character. We need an education for living as well as for livelihood, no doubt; but for some of us the pressure of competition is making the getting of a bare livelihood so difficult that it has to form an enormous part of our conscious life. The necessity of a self-centred life turns our minds almost exclusively on questions as to what we shall eat, and what we shall drink, and wherewithal we shall be clothed. We see that men who possess an ample share of the good things of this world are free from the harsh friction of a life given over to a distracting attention to bare animal needs; we see them occupying positions of honour and influence; that they can command the best of education, and thus win an easy triumph in the struggle for existence that goes on below the thin veneer of modern civilization, or can pay for talent to be used in their service when it does not fall to them as a natural endowment; and, when we see all this, we conclude that the best kind of belief in an intensely practical world like ours is a plenary faith in the "gospel of getting on," accompanied by a substantial body of works performed with special reference to our personal interests. When we find that hard drudgery is seldom linked with liberal incomes, and that those who live laborious lives in tainted and stifling atmospheres and loathsome workshops see least of elegant drawing-rooms, and have smallest access to bracing air and salubrious climates, we are strongly inclined to believe that the greatest possible use we can make of such talents and energies as have fallen to our lot will be in elbowing our way to a more commodious position in the world.

We have the desire "to rise in the world" fostered still further by a supply of literature written in response to a demand on the part of the "have-nots" to secure a prominent place amongst the "haves;" telling us of "men who have risen" and "men who have made themselves," of "fortunes made in business," of poor lads who had a faculty for finding horse-shoes at the beginning of life and big fortunes at the end of it; and all this with but scant reference to the serious economic problems that would confront us if we were obliged to keep a world of millionnaires. There are few ragged urchins pattering their naked feet on the pavement of our streets who have not been fired into resolving that the same or similar paving-stones shall rattle with their own carriage and pair. Not only do men of lowly positions resolve to gain higher, but the more energetic and persevering of them do so; but what is a gain to themselves is a loss, considered from one important aspect, to the class from which they spring. As a class we have lost a large measure of energy, and ability born amongst us, which, had it been worth its while to stay with us, would have made us stronger, and, exercised in the interest of the class, would have helped on the work of industrial and social regeneration. The leaders of our labour movement may show at times a want of due restraint in pressing the claims of those they represent, but the fact that they are willing to use their great abilities in the service of their fellow-workers proves that the working class in the future may be able to retain what ability and talent may fall to its share, and utilize it to organize its own forces for getting a more substantial acknowledgment of its claims. If we are to do this on any large scale, we shall have to lessen the inducements which working men have for drifting away to other spheres of life, where their influence and worth is used only so far as they create fresh capital to be employed mainly for squeezing still larger fortunes out of us.

Robbed of some of its greatest energies by the causes just pointed out, can we wonder that the working class has had a long, and hitherto an almost fruitless, struggle to get out of some of its greatest difficulties and some of its worst vices?

Whilst debating in favour of the working man in one of our public parks with a man who had risen out of his position as a workman, and also out of all sympathy with the class to which he originally belonged, the writer was told that the working class were the most selfish, the most coarse and ignorant, fickle and ungrateful set of men in the world, and that when I had lived as long and knew as much about them as he, I should come to form the same opinion. With so much in our lives to accentuate the inherent selfishness of the race, it has been difficult for us to combine and find the strength and mutual help that lie in the union of numbers; with so much persistent attention to mere animal existence, it were difficult to be other than coarse and ignorant; with the chances of a bare subsistence so uncertain, it is not surprising that we should seem fickle and wayward; with a vague consciousness that the world's hardest work has had to be done by one set of men, and the fruits of it shared out to another set, the working class have sometimes had great difficulty in keeping back sullen resentment where gratitude may have been expected. With throats parched with dry and irritating dust, or with bodies hot and clammy with working at enormous temperatures, is it inexplicable that we should have an inordinate capacity for drink? and, with minds jaded with hard and taxing work to obtain a precarious livelihood, are we without excuse for flying to vigorous stimulants for relief? and are we wholly to blame if, when an unscrupulous capitalism is allowed to rear its gaudy gin-palaces and demoralizing singing saloons, an inevitable physical demand is sometimes converted into a domineering animal passion that saturates our bodies with enervating poisons, and our lives with hideous vice?

Accepting our share of the blame for presenting to the world as much sodden wickedness as our worst enemies can possibly lay to our charge, we have to reply that our suffering seems often out of proportion to our sin. Nemesis either looks with oblique eyes on the doings of the children of men, or some of her agencies bungle in carrying out her behests. We are at the mercy of the caprice, the avarice, the competency or

incompetency of the capitalist. If part of our class conceive they have a grievance against their masters, which they will neither admit nor remedy, we have all to feel the effects of the disastrous struggle. What comes to other ranks of society as a prospective evil, a reduction of a liberal income, or a slight diminution of life's luxuries, comes to many of us as a crushing calamity to the most fundamental instincts of our common humanity. Haunted by a growing suspicion that there is a fundamental moral defect in the constitution of things, that civilization is but a product of the centuries for making the mean and selfish into millionnaires, and the nobler spirits of the world into suicides, the more thoughtful and finely strung amongst us are finding it more and more difficult to hold by the faith of our childhood. The idea that the whole fabric of law and order is a piece of imposing fetishism slowly elaborated through the ages by the intelligent few, to secure the protecting veneration and respect of the ignorant many for every one's rights but their own, is gradually working its insidious way amongst us; and can we be condemned when our main source of knowledge on these subjects has been by getting into prison or craving the dubious benevolence of the workhouse?

Probably we have an exaggerated sense of our own grievances, but the conditions of our lives are such as to make us feel most acutely what we have least chance of understanding correctly. The general outlook on the labour question of our day will, however, impress every one with the fact that industrial problems are reaching a crucial point, when the more energetic workmen are determined to take up a firmer attitude on what they conceive to be the rights of labour. Those of us who study these questions from the inside sympathetically, and who watch the gathering resentment of our own class against those in high places, who have not always acted from high-minded motives, are convinced that the struggle between capital and labour, and between unearned privilege and unremunerated toil, is but in its initial stage. Stately language about economic laws, which are admittedly but extremely variable modes of economic activity depending largely on an

equally variable mass of complicated human motives, will not deter them from confronting one set of these motives by another set that get their strength and persistence from sources embedded in the primary instincts of our race. I do not believe that the bulk of the working class have decided on an appeal to might irrespective of the right of the case, nor do I believe that they approve of all the flippant utterances of some of our labour leaders on this subject. Some of us are prepared to admit that the returns to capital may not be as great as formerly, and that we shall have to learn to look at these problems from other standpoints than our own. While, however, we admit that percentages are low, we can see that individual capitalists are amassing large fortunes through the concentration of capital in a few hands. People who are continually threatening to shut up their mills and resort to the workhouse, and at the same time are helping to crowd our thoroughfares with their magnificent carriages, and decorating our suburbs with splendid mansions, are sure in the long run to be credited with using language of astonishing elasticity. Even the poorer classes are beginning to see that wealth is accumulating at one end of society and poverty intensifying at the other; and the disposition to make an attempt to arrest the crushing effect upon themselves is growing stronger and spreading more widely. We have had abundant evidence that, unless the labour movement is conducted with the utmost caution, we may soon be in a condition of industrial paralysis and social disorder.

The practical question to consider is, how can we steer clear of a serious collision between the different interests involved in any industrial and social rearrangements that may take place? That there should be some rearrangement that will insure to the workman a larger share of the products of his labour seems to be widely admitted. Working men have sometimes asked, "What class outside the working class themselves are making any large and well organized attempt in furtherance of this object?" Forced by sheer necessity workmen have organized their system of trades-unionism

that they might curb the action of a competition that was thrusting them into all the abominations of the sweating system. After a long and severe struggle to prove that working men could combine for other purposes than conspiracy against the State and against the lives and limbs of Her Majesty's obedient and respectable subjects, public opinion and sympathy have been won to the side of trades-unionism. Yet public opinion and sympathy will avail but little unless they can transform themselves into definite, practical lines of action, harmonizing in their main objects with those of labour combinations. With the generous help, and under the wise guidance of some of England's noblest sons, we have been enabled to organize over the length and breadth of the land a system of co-operation that goes a long way towards shutting the competitive element out of some departments of our economic life. We may not have fulfilled all the hopes of our sincerest friends, nor do we expect to satisfy the armchair criticism that speaks with a large amount of theoretical knowledge, but with a small amount of practical acquaintance with the actual difficulties of the work. It ought to be remembered that the intermittent educational influences of our co-operative life are continually being traversed and thwarted by the accumulated effects on our class of centuries of harsh contact with the influence of the competitive system that have come to us with a peculiar emphasis.

With an organized attempt for checking, and another for eliminating the stress of competition on our industrial life, is not the working class justified in turning to the other ranks of society and asking if they are prepared to organize themselves for helping on the same objects? Some of us hailed the gigantic scheme for bringing all our coal-fields under a great trust with delight, a scheme which many of us could scarcely distinguish from a special application of the co-operative principle. There may be many very unsatisfactory points about the proposals, but the broad spirit in which they are conceived has made some of us hope that the coming struggle may not be as severe as we have been led to believe, if this scheme gives

us a correct indication of the drift of opinion and enterprise among capitalists as a class.

About twelve months ago, through the kindness of a friend, a copy of the *Economic Review* found its way into the hands of the writer. As he read its pages his pleasure was as great as his surprise to find that the Christian Social Union was attempting something very similar to what he and his comrades have talked about and wished for. Here, at any rate, we saw an organization, with social aims, framed for other purposes than giving good advice to workmen, and without any special reference to an excessive amount of original sin among poor people. It startled us somewhat to find a dignitary of the Church and a gifted man of letters bringing the powers of a well-disciplined mind to champion the cause of trades-unionism, and show how closely allied its work is to that of the Church, whose Founder and King, in His human relations, was emphatically one of ourselves. If working men could be thus convinced of the real sympathy and the active co-operation of men in other ranks of life for rectifying some of the inequalities of society, it would go a long way towards taking the keen edge from much of their adversity and distress, and assuaging the bitterness that has been deeply lodged in their hearts.

Touched by the large and genuine sympathy which underlies the work of the Christian Social Union, and convinced of the practical service that may be rendered through its agency, the writer has been induced to devote a considerable part of his scanty leisure to the work of showing, so far as his abilities will allow, what are the physical, moral, and social effects of our present-day stress of competition on those in daily converse with its influences. In attempting this task he has been conscious of great limitations. For aught he knows to the contrary he may have done violence to every recognized canon of journalism; but if he has succeeded in helping any one to understand a little better the struggling mass of humanity, conventionally known as the working class, he will be satisfied. He has been influenced, to some extent, in what he has said

by what he has had to suffer himself in his sojourn through life as a workman ; but more prominently in his memory has been the thought of loved comrades who have striven nobly to climb with him the steep of life, if perchance they might gain some of its shining heights, but, baffled and exhausted with the hardships of their lot, have fallen by his side, dying with the conviction that the very fates were against them. If, by the least particle, in any direct or indirect manner, he can make the way of life easier for his fellow-workers of the future than it has been for himself, it will be with him a lasting joy ; and, in furtherance of such an object, he will be for ever grateful for the honour and privilege of pleading their cause before those who have to judge from standpoints where much will not be understood, because it has never been a part of personal experience.

ROBERT HALSTEAD.

WORKING MEN'S CLUBS.

I SUPPOSE that in no respect has social and philanthropic work changed more during the last twenty years than in the development of working men's clubs. It is not necessary to be middle-aged to remember the time, when it was an ideal of reformers to have in every district a place, apart from the public-houses, where a man could spend his evenings with his fellows pleasantly and rationally: the ideal then seemed hard to realize; now it may be pronounced a fact. But, as usually happens with the attainment of the ideal, there have come doubts whether it really accomplishes what it was expected to do; some people say that ordinary working men's clubs are "mere unlicensed drinking-shops;" others, speaking of parish clubs, point to such facts as that one of the leading London clergy has closed three which were under him, because he found them, however satisfactory in other respects, quite useless as part of his religious machinery.

The question as to the value of clubs was raised some time ago at a meeting of the Oxford University branch of the Christian Social Union, and it was decided to collect information on the subject. Accordingly a paper was issued with questions bearing both on the conduct of clubs and on their results, social and religious. About sixty sets of answers have been received,¹ besides a considerable number of private letters. An attempt will be made in the following pages to summarize, as far as

¹ Of these, twenty-three came from London clubs, twenty-two from large provincial towns, five from smaller towns, and six from villages. The rest were mainly as to boys' clubs; we had one set of answers from New York. It should be stated distinctly that all the answers come from parochial clubs, or clubs like those which exist in connection with the Oxford House in Bethnal Green.

possible, the results which can be arrived at from these various sources.¹ It may be well to divide these under three heads.

I. Points as to the actual conduct of clubs.

II. Are clubs valuable as part of the educational and social machinery?

III. Are they valuable for directly religious work? and what should be the attitude of the clergy towards them?

The first question as to the actual conduct of clubs, was with regard to the permanency of members. Here it is difficult to classify accurately, because some of the answers were expressed in figures, and others by such words as "fairly," "mostly;" but of the forty-three returns which bore on this point, about 60 per cent. speak of members as being "mostly" permanent, or put the percentage of those who are so at 66 per cent. and upwards. Curiously enough the percentage of permanence is higher in London than in the provinces. Where members are transitory, it is generally attributed to the fact that the "neighbourhood is a migratory one." On the whole it seems certain that, in a club, membership tends to become permanent, and that it is the best members who remain. Several of the answers speak of members staying "till they marry:" this would seem to confirm the obvious suggestion that a successful club is likely to be a considerable check on too early marriages. However, not sufficient of the papers refer to this point to warrant any definite statement.

The next question was a more difficult one—*i.e.* Can a club be made self-supporting, either with or without a building rent free? Twenty-six of those before me claim to be self-supporting, exclusive of rent or original outlay; sixteen need help even to meet current expenses. Ten more claim to be able to meet every expense, including rent: but of these one had its premises

¹ I had thought originally of beginning by a tabulated statement of the answers received; but this seems undesirable for the following reasons:—

a. It would involve repetition.

b. The number of answers received, though considerable in itself, is perhaps hardly sufficient to warrant a separate printing of the percentages it gives.

c. Many of the answers can hardly be classified, as those who send them leave points uncertain. And much of the most valuable information came in the form of letters, independently of the paper of questions first issued.

presented ; a second (in the North) paid for them out of "football gates ;" others speak of receiving some help from subscriptions or entertainments. It is only two or three of the large clubs in East London which claim to be able to meet all expenses, rent included, out of ordinary revenue, even though the subscription be but a penny or three-halfpence a week. But there seems no doubt that a club, if well managed, can pay its way when it receives its premises rent free. And more than this, several of the answers received speak of injury to clubs from their having too ready access to the pockets of managers and patrons.

With regard to the question of refreshments, there is practical unanimity. More than 80 per cent. of the clubs supply them, but all except two of those *in towns* exclude, or advise the exclusion of, alcoholic drinks : of those two, one is not a working-man's club at all, the other has a rather unfavourable report given of it. Most of the clubs express a very decided opinion on this point. In two cases of breakdown which I have before me, the failure of the club is distinctly dated from the introduction of alcohol. Such unanimity seems to be worth a good deal, although I know one prominent clergyman in London who considers it a mistake to run a club on total-abstinence principles (I have not, however, his opinion before me in writing). On the other hand, of the six village clubs, four permit the sale of alcohol, and a fifth is doubtful on the point. The rule in two of these is that no member may have more than three glasses in an evening. As the beer is "better and cheaper than that of the public-house," it is not surprising that they meet with considerable hostility from the local publicans. Perhaps the reason for this difference between town and country is, that the clubs in the latter, being smaller, cannot afford to dispense with this attraction.

In answer to the question whether prize competitions and social entertainments are useful, the vast majority of the clubs answer in the affirmative ; of these, rather more than half speak of some subsidies in aid as being necessary, but several state that these are very small, or are "decreasing." Some of those who answer speak of the value of the social evenings, to which

members can bring their sweethearts or wives ; as one gentleman puts it, "Dancing has its value."

The balance of opinion is against the success of lectures and classes, though in many cases one or both of these have been held with good results. In one or two Ambulance lectures have done well. I think that, on the whole, the answer from a South London club sums up at once my own experience and the general tone of the replies now before me: "All our educational efforts have failed ; we have lectures once in three weeks to which members give a civil attention ;" this, however, is too unfavourable in its first part, and too favourable in its latter part, to be absolutely correct. Perhaps the best conclusion on the subject of classes is that which comes from a successful club in East London: the writer, after stating that classes can hardly be made self-supporting, except in a club of five hundred members, goes on to suggest that those who wish for instruction, should be encouraged to attend the evening classes at the Board School.

The same kind of suggestion—that is, of having recourse to agencies outside the club—seems to be often carried out as to the next point of inquiry—whether it was usual to have a benefit society in connection with the club? Some answered this question in the affirmative;¹ but, from the majority the answer was, that men belonged to their own provident associations independently of the club.

To come now to the most important remaining question as to the actual conduct of clubs, *i.e.* "Have you had any serious difficulty in the maintenance of order?" More than half the clubs answer that they have had none, or none that was serious. In those which admit that disorder has occurred, it is almost always spoken of as a thing of the past, and as conquered. Only in two or three cases is it stated that the tone is bad, and that the "members have got out of hand."

Of the causes of trouble, betting or gambling is the most frequent, though only mentioned in six or seven clubs ; in

¹ A slate club seems very frequently to be established in connection with a parish club.

others, but only two or three, bad language is complained of. In one or two cases the "younger members" were a difficulty, till they were provided with a separate club. Experience, I think, goes to show that it is a great mistake to fix the age-limit of a club too low.

Some of the special causes of disorder or difficulty are curious. In one town in Lancashire a "Church set" was formed, the members of which tried to get things all their own way; failing in this, they, after a struggle, left. In another north-country club, the only grave disorder had been caused by the drunkenness of the local policeman, who, therefore, had to resign. In a third, a boys'¹ club—also in the North—order was restored in a way so characteristic that I must quote the writer's own words:—

"After speaking to the members several times collectively, and to some individually, and not finding any improvement when I was not there, I picked out two of the ringleaders, after one noisy evening, and gave them each a single-stick and helmet, and took one myself. I said, 'We are now going to settle who is to manage this gymnasium.' We settled it, and I had no further trouble; but those two were off work next day, and they now help to keep order."

In a large number of the answers, special stress is laid on the necessity of a committee of the men themselves, one of whom should be present on all occasions, and who are responsible for order. At the same time, in very many cases, the writer insists that there should be present the clergyman, or an educated layman, to act as a controlling influence. To quote an answer from a South London parish, where difficulties from disorder seem never to have occurred, "a club should be a democracy, tempered by friendship and personal influence." In one or two cases the ultimate control of the club is vested in the vicar by the fact that it meets on Church premises, and would lose these, if it persisted in any course against his will; *e.g.* in one case alcohol was excluded in this way. This check seems to work well, where used.

To turn now to the second part of the subject—the value of clubs as part of the educational and social machinery of a

¹ But all working in mines, and some of them twenty years of age.

parish. The first question was—Can you trace any increase in power of club management or organization ?

As to this the evidence is very decided. Eighty per cent. of the answers received speak of improvement in this respect, most of them without any qualification. In one club the original clerical secretary has been replaced by a working man; in another, the constant presence of the vicar is no longer needed. Of course difficulties are here and there referred to; *e.g.* in one north-country town there is a tendency to put men on the committee because they are good football players, not because they are likely to have a good influence. In the general election, just held, a strong Church majority on the committee had been secured by "management," but the men were perfectly prepared to agree to this. On the whole, it seems evident that the presence of a gentleman on the committee is desirable, provided he has tact, and uses his influence rightly: left to themselves, the members of a committee are apt to be "afraid of making themselves unpopular by enforcing rules," and to fall into mutual jealousies. One of the largest clubs in East London was, I know, almost ruined by the prolonged illness of the chairman of its committee.

The second question under this head was as to improvement in the personal character of its members. As is replied in one case, "such improvement cannot be tabulated;" but of the forty-four who sent answers to the question, forty do so in the affirmative, and many very decidedly. To quote one strong instance from a north-country club,—

"Men who could hardly find proposers, on account of their general disrespectability, settled down into first-class members, and even members of committee."

In two or three cases, however—mainly mentioned in the letters sent privately, not in the answers to questions—harm is said to have been done to those who were once religious:—

"The club diverts the young from the exclusive interest in religion which they had at one time; but, though this may sound strange, I don't think this a bad thing altogether."

So the matter is summed up by one hard-working, London clergyman. I have not had the advantage of hearing the explanation of this "heresy," which he offers to give his correspondent *viva voce*; but I certainly think that I know what he means, and that he is, in a great measure, at any rate, quite right. However, this belongs to the third part of my subject, which merges imperceptibly into that just dealt with, viz. the religious effects of clubs, and their claim to be part of a parish machinery.

Here, I think, it is useless to state general percentages; so obviously often does the character of the answer vary with the character of the writer—whether he be sanguine or not—or with the standard which he proposes to himself; one man speaks of a club as being most useful religiously, because it enables him to know the members; another says it is not useful, because it gives no direct opportunities for religious influence. Again, one or two of the clubs from which I have answers, have religious tests for membership, although the great majority have none.

Obviously there are several distinct views held on this point. In the first place, all those who have had clubs with a definite religious test speak well of them.¹ I may quote the words of a well-known East End worker:—

"I think there is a great deal to be said for communicants' clubs, or, rather, for clubs of those who are either confirmed or willing to be confirmed. The idea of such a club is to get together the men who have got as far as believing the Church is the right thing. The club becomes a sort of refuge from the wicked world, and an exhibition to the world of the joy of a Christian life."

It is further clear that some think, and many of them men most qualified to judge, that such a club is preferable to one on a more general base. "You must decide whether a club is to be organized in strict connection with the Church or for the general benefit of the men," writes one of the ablest of

¹ At the same time, some point out the danger of these. A friend writes: "I think Communicants' Guilds ought to have a social aspect; but I deprecate social clubs of communicants. They would foster that damnable Pharisaism which is the shadow apparently inseparable from any religious profession."

the young clergy in the north of England. And this position is confirmed negatively by some eight or ten reports which speak of general clubs as failures from the religious point of view, or worse.

But, on the other hand, there is a decidedly larger body of opinion, which is strongly in favour of general clubs. Some twenty of my sets of answers speak decidedly of the indirect value of the club as breaking down the prejudice against the clergy, and bringing them into contact with the men in their parish. I cannot put this point better than by quoting from the letter of an East London vicar :—

“In the ordinary routine of parish duty, the parson has very few opportunities of meeting the men. He visits their wives, possibly he teaches their children, probably he censures their vices behind their backs ; but they never come to church. At best he is identified with maudlin kindness and petticoat civilities ; at worst he is a meddlesome fraud—half drone, half ogre, wholly detestable. I value for myself an institution which brings me into contact with the men ; friendly relations are not hard to create when contact is secured.”

And, further, almost as many more answers—seventeen in all—speak of clubs as having been found most useful, directly as well as indirectly, although they had no religious tests ; men have been brought to church, workers have been secured, candidates enrolled for confirmation. I may quote one of many instances : of a north-country club of ninety men—which has been in existence four years, and whose members are almost entirely employed on the railway—the vicar writes :—

“It has helped materially in bringing men to church, has supplied me with some twenty confirmation candidates, and numbers some fifty communicants among its members. There are some of them Sunday-school teachers, and four of them are sidesmen.”

On the whole, then, the balance of evidence is decided in favour of a general club being a valuable part of parish machinery, either indirectly or directly, or both.

Before ending, I should like to refer to two ideals which have come before me, of directly opposite kinds. The first is from a clergyman working in South London, and is the only view

I have come across which is adverse to clubs *in principle*. He writes:—

“In this matter, as in so many, there seems to be far too much subtle but actual ‘love of the world.’ The socialism and social ways and goings-on of ‘Clubland,’ whether amongst the rich or poor loafers, is not an ideal that the Church should do anything but shudder at. . . . Our society work must be after God’s idea of society, which, of course, is based on the *Family*.”

The whole letter is interesting, but I cannot quote more.

My other quotation is from a valuable manuscript paper on this subject by a vicar in a west-country city—a paper which I should like to see published entire in the *Economic Review*, or elsewhere. He writes:—

“As the clergy of a National Church, I consider the club a necessary part of our parochial machinery, as necessary as schools, and in some parishes as necessary as the church, if we are teaching that the whole life of man must be consecrated to God, his body not less than his soul. . . . The club is a means, and a most important one, of removing this prejudice [against the clergy]. Its very existence is a proof that the Church is concerned with some part of the life of the people which now is, and not exclusively with the life that is to come. And it is this part of life which is at present the first concern, perhaps the only concern, of many of them.”

The paper contains many valuable suggestions for the practical working of clubs; but I must not quote more. I feel that my treatment of my material is very scrappy and inadequate; but it was hard to bring together the various opinions on so many points. I only hope that what I have written may perhaps be of some little help to those who are already employed in this branch of work, and may suggest a point or two to those who shall enter on it in the future.

J. WELLS.

THE COAL WAR.

I. CANNOCK CHASE.

FOR months before the actual outbreak of hostilities the air was full of disquieting rumours. A conflict was thought inevitable by the more knowing both of the coal-owners and coal-getters. Few, however, on either side can have anticipated the severity and duration of the struggle. Most of them supposed that four, or at the outside six weeks, would see the end of it. By that time the masters calculated that the miners would have exhausted their Union funds, from which large contributions had been made to the men on strike in Durham, in the Forest of Dean, and elsewhere, and would be obliged to yield to fear of want; and the miners, that the masters would be receiving their orders for the winter, and feel constrained to yield through greed of gain. Every combatant was sanguine that victory was assured to him at the close of a brief campaign. But in man, clothed whether with broad-cloth or with fustian, there is a great deal of human nature, and an enlightened self-interest, notwithstanding the common apotheosis of it, does not exhaust the forces which seriously affect his conduct. The beginning of strife is still the letting out of water, and a weather-forecast by Zadkiel would probably be as accurate as the predictions of those superior persons, those practical men of sound common sense, with whom it is too generally supposed that wisdom would die, of what will happen in an industrial war.

The initial blunder was made by the employers. They asked for a reduction too late, and they asked for too much. Ours is principally a house-coal trade. During summer, therefore, work is always, this year it was exceptionally, slack. Mr. Bidder,

who is quite incapable of wilfully misrepresenting facts, is mistaken if he supposes that his men in this parish had four full days' work since Christmas! His pits, too, are superior to some others in the neighbourhood. Up to within a fortnight of the lock-out, many stallmen had not been in receipt of fifteen shillings a week, and it was tantalizing to them in the extreme to have any benefits of more regular employment withdrawn from them, just as they seemed to be within their reach. And then the amount of the demand upon them! At first they believed that it was for five shillings, and they were not mollified when they found that it was for three-and-sixpence in the pound. True, they had been granted 40 per cent. advance on the wages of five years ago. But previous to that date they had found it hard to make both ends meet, and since then their expenses had increased, their rents had been raised, and privileges had been taken from them in the mines. It was really proposed that they should revert to within, not 15 but 10 per cent. of their earnings in 1888. These had gone up by degrees, 5 or 10 per cent. at a time; they were to go down at one fell swoop to within measurable distance of the starvation wages, which they remembered so well and resented so bitterly. It appeared as if the colliery proprietors were actuated by ulterior motives, by a desire to get rid at high prices of their accumulated stocks, and a determination to break the back of the Miners' Federation.

And, assuredly, if the masters had wanted to provoke a strike, they could not have laid their plans more skilfully than they did. Mr. Pickard has more than once made the uncontradicted statement that, when he met them in July, he asked that time might be given for the miners' agents to consult their constituents in their respective districts. This was not done. Nor did any master, so far as I am aware, attempt to explain to his employees the reasons for the proposed reduction. During the Dock Strike at Hull, Mr. Wilson did not hesitate to appear before his men and remonstrate with them. During the late lock-out, Mr. Beckett, the Member for Whitby, addressed a large audience of colliers, and tried to

persuade them to yield. He was not successful, but neither he nor Mr. Wilson lost anything by their pluck. Very different was the behaviour of the colliery proprietors. Notices were put up at every pit-head that contracts would cease at the close of a fortnight. It was a business transaction throughout, and looked like the conduct of hirelings, who had a keen eye to the wool, but cared not for the sheep. That the miners would have submitted to the smallest reduction of wages, I am not prepared to say. My contention is, that any step at all calculated to produce a state of things in which thousands upon thousands of families may be left without the means of subsistence should never be taken until all that Christian ingenuity can devise has been done to prevent so terrible a calamity. The men may be unreasonable, but, if they are, the unwisdom with which they have recently been treated, suggests the reason why.

I do not hold a brief for the miners. Their Federation has, in my judgment, committed a series of mistakes. Last year it ordered the men out of the pits at a time when no reduction of wages was threatened; and this year the wisest policy would have been, I think, to make terms with the masters for a time, and then, when the large orders came in, to have required an increase of wages. I felt, too, and still feel, that it was folly to prevent men working where they were receiving the old rate of wages. The act wore the appearance of a blow, deliberately aimed at the whole trade of the country, in the interests of a particular class. Still, it should be remembered, that many coal-owners, whose mines remain open whilst the rest are closed, are the men who undersell others, and so keep down prices and wages, and that almost invariably they take advantage of any reduction gained by sufferings and losses in which they have had no share. It is "Heads, I win; and tails, you lose," with them. Once more, I thought that the miners would have acted wisely to have accepted the offer made in the first negotiations in November. But I have lived long enough to know that there is no such thing as an effect without a cause on earth, and long enough amongst miners to know that the agents are not the sole or even the primary cause of the

attitude of those whom they represent. Whipping-boys are a convenient luxury; but they are a dangerous one if they divert attention from the true safeguards against grave national dangers, and the only real bases of national prosperity. “Ὡς περ γὰρ οἰκίας, οἶμαι, καὶ πλοίου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τοιούτων τὰ κάτωθεν ἰσχυρότατα εἶναι δεῖ, οὕτω καὶ τῶν πράξεων τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ὑποθέσεις ἀληθεῖς καὶ δικαίας εἶναι προσήκει.”

It is hard to say how far the agents were responsible for the decisions of the miners during the late crisis. My belief is, that their influence, though considerable, is over-rated. They can, and no doubt do, by their speeches put new ideas into the minds of their constituents, and induce them occasionally to commit themselves to a certain course of action. But like most representatives they believe themselves under an obligation to reckon with the various elements of the public opinion, to which they are indebted for their position. It is easy to criticise them. I am much more disposed to pity them. My astonishment is not that they say so many things that are rash, but that they say so few; not that they sometimes err, but that in the main their influence is so strongly for good. Almost always in a league, association, union, whether secular or religious, there is a violent and noisy faction, who do not shrink from unscrupulous means to gain their ends. They tyrannize and terrorize after their kind. They may not be a majority or even a large minority of the society, but they are often numerous enough, if seriously offended, to jeopardize its existence. I am myself persuaded that, as a rule, too much attention is paid them, and that those are the safest and in the long run the most trusted leaders who simply speak the truth and aim at what is right in the scorn of consequence. But such men, alas! are few and far between, in any rank in life: and the penalty exacted from them for faithfulness is often a heavy one. Mr. Burt nearly lost the seat which he adorns in Parliament, Mr. Morley provoked a violent opposition to his return, and Messrs. Cobden and Bright, at the time of the Crimean war, were rejected at the hustings because they rebuked the madness of the people. Moreover, when the agents attempted to prevent the Durham strike, they failed.

The fight went on without them and in spite of them. No doubt the agents have done much to create the Miners' Federation, and possibly may have so belauded it as to lead the men to regard it as an omnipotent machine. But again and again, if it had not been for their moderating influence, far more extravagant things would have been said and done. Mr. Pickard was, I understand, denounced in some Lancashire meetings for suggesting that the men might accept a 10 per cent. reduction in April next; and here, as I presume elsewhere, after the failure of the first negotiations in November, there were miners anxious to bring out of the pits those who were at work and to propose a resolution that none of them would return to work except at an advance of 20 per cent. on the old rate of wages. The agents were successful in putting these wild schemes on one side. So far as I can judge, they very fairly interpret the opinions of the men; but I think it possible that, with a view of preventing a split in the Union, they think themselves compelled to humour more or less the more violent spirits amongst their supporters. I have compassion upon poor Lo Bengula. The rashness of his younger warriors has played beautifully into the hands of the philanthropists who covet his gold. But he is only an African. The agents are Englishmen, and will, I suspect, be able to hold their own. Whatsoever gentlemen, who sneer at them as paid or fluent agitators, may imagine, they are necessary to associations which have done much and will probably do more for the wellbeing of the hand-workers; and if they are not perfect, they are, with all their imperfections, very useful public servants.

Let me briefly describe the organization by which they are elected and kept in office. On Cannock Chace there are thirty-two lodges, connected for the most part with particular pits. Each of these lodges annually elects in open meeting a committee, a chairman, a treasurer, and a secretary. At the same time, it elects a delegate to act on a central council. This central council in its turn elects nine men, who are ordinarily, but not necessarily, members of it, to be an executive for the purpose of carrying out its resolutions. To the thirty-two delegates on this central

council are added the secretaries, who are very generally checkweighers. On all ordinary questions the secretaries are allowed to vote; but when matters of grave importance, such, for instance, as whether or no there shall be a strike, have to be determined, the delegates alone record the votes of the previously consulted lodges, one vote being given for every fifty members of a lodge. At the meetings of the council all questions affecting the interests of miners are frankly discussed. Every one present is at liberty to bring forward a resolution, and to speak to those which others have brought forward. But a decision once arrived at, every member of the council is bound, unless he gives in his resignation, to advocate such decision in every way he can. It may therefore be taken for granted that, when the agents speak with authority, they know very well that they have their clients behind them. For instance, when they objected to arbitration, it was because the word stinks in the nostrils of the men, from the conviction that past arbitrations had been of too limited a scope, one sided, and unfair. The majority, however, of the miners have always admitted that some tribunal should exist for the settlement of trade disputes, and—

“That which we call a rose
By any other name will smell as sweet.”

I have, I think, known educated and religious men flare up at the words Priest and Altar, and quietly concede all that the words imply, when Presbyter and Holy Table were used instead.

The miners are not, I am persuaded, incapable of being won to contentment with their lot. Whilst the strike lasted their conduct in the neighbourhood was exemplary. There were a few depredations and a disturbance which seemed likely to lead to a riot. But this was soon over, and there was no recurrence of it. It was the work of some larrikins and a number of silly women. Of the good conduct and patient endurance of the people, as a whole, it is impossible to speak too highly. Nor must I omit to mention the admirable way in which the miners organized themselves for the relief of distress throughout the whole neighbourhood. Every home was visited, the size of

every family was ascertained, and the amount of food apportioned to each according to the number of its members. Provision, moreover, was made for all cases of exceptional suffering. The suggestion of this undertaking came originally from tradesmen in this place, but the working out of it fell necessarily for the most part on the miners themselves. From those who were associated with them, I hear only one opinion as to the diligence, the justice, the caution, and the practical wisdom which characterized the fulfilment of their task. This bodes well, I submit, for the probable results of establishing parish and district councils.

What will be the effects of the strike? This is a hard question.

1. Some of its material consequences are obvious enough. Savings have been exhausted, the trust funds depleted; debts, which it will take a long time to pay, have been contracted; tradesmen have been nearly ruined; about £100,000 has been lost in wages.

2. But far more serious may be its moral results. There is always something sordid in a fight for money. It is apt to draw away the mind from the nobler aims and ends of life, and tends to intensify materialistic conceptions of human existence: art, science, and, above all, religion are liable to suffer in the process. Besides, in the hatred and suspicion generated or deepened between the combatants may possibly be the seeds of future conflicts, on a much larger scale, and with more disastrous consequences. War often leads to wars. A lasting peace is rarely the result of it, unless one side is completely crushed. That cannot be said to be the case in regard to either capital or labour in the recent struggle.

3. The Miners' Federation is stronger than it was. It may have no money; but it has more influence than it ever had. It is destined, I believe, to extend its borders, and the experience which it has gained, will make it much more formidable than before. I can readily understand the masters' regarding it as a huge menace to our present industrial system. It is likely in the near future, unless a better understanding can be brought

about between the employers and employed, to become a much greater danger.

4. But is this impossible? One result of the late struggle gives me hope. The kindness shown the miners has surprised them. Hitherto they have been, as it were, too much a race of Ishmaels. Now they perceive that they are regarded by many in all ranks in life as brother-men and fellow-citizens. A powerful section of the Daily Press has advocated their cause. Tradesmen, themselves suffering from the lock-out, have subscribed for the relief of their distress. Contributions of money, clothing, and food have poured into every mining district from persons of all political creeds and religious persuasions. The very employers, in many instances, have, with a noble inconsistency, given largely towards feeding women and children. Moreover, from every pit-bank the poor were allowed to get what coal they could, and they managed, I believe, to secure in this way thousands of tons. At the close of the struggle the men in public meeting unanimously passed a vote of thanks to the colliery proprietors for granting them so valuable a privilege. In short, the generosity manifested during the lock-out has brought home to many a collier's heart the truth that Christianity is a reality, a blessed and potent reality.

5. It will, I trust, do more. Both masters and men have been wont to look upon an occasional fight as a necessary accident of business. "It is," they have said, "the way we have" in the coal-trade. We are good old English colliers, "all of the olden time." The very different view now taken of so great a calamity may, perhaps, lead them to regard strikes and lock-outs in another light, as survivals of barbarism, criminal anachronisms, stupid sins, shameful to the age in which we live and the religion which we profess.

"These were the rough ways of the world till now."

But now, inasmuch as it is clear that Christianity has so permeated the mind of England that the pangs of hunger can no longer be reckoned upon as an effective weapon of industrial war, there is a better prospect that these brutal contests will

give place to Boards of Conciliation and National Tribunals for the settlement of trade disputes.

6. So far, it seems to me that the employers have been deceiving themselves as well as others by conjuring with the words "the law of supply and demand." The phrase, as now too often used, constitutes an indictment of the Factory Acts, of the abolition of Slavery, and of all endeavours to get rid of the sweating system. That the law exists is no doubt true; but then it is surely our wisdom so to apply it as to bring forth contentment amongst our brother men.

"The increase of the demand," says Adam Smith, "though in the beginning it may sometimes raise the price of goods, never fails to lower it in the long run. It encourages production, and thereby increases the competition of the producers who, in order to undersell one another, have recourse to new divisions of labour, and new improvements of art, which might never otherwise have been thought of."

This may be very desirable; but it is no justification for the production of a commodity very greatly in excess of the probable demand for it. The employers would show greater prudence if, in obedience to the law of supply and demand, they devised means for checking the employment of unnecessary miners in their pits, and the opening up of unnecessary mines. The aid of the Legislature might be invoked. For it is to the interest of the entire nation that the fuel upon which her prosperity so largely depends should not be recklessly wasted.

7. Another outcome of the strike will, I hope, be that the employers will make themselves better acquainted with their men. Absenteeism does not tend to love. Every unpopular thing done in the pits is now credited to them. I know many of them to be kind-hearted Christian gentlemen; but no testimonial from me would be sufficient to dispel a distrust which the recollection of long neglect has created amongst the miners. With them, at any rate, the proverb, "*Omne ignotum pro magnifico*," does not hold good: it is much more true "*qui-cunque ignotus pro inimico*."

8. Besides, the presence of employers is really needed on other grounds. The whole tonnage system ought to be recon-

sidered. It is the cause of much dissatisfaction, and, I am afraid, of some demoralization. There are miners and miners, pits and pits, stalls and stalls. The averages of miners' wages which have recently appeared in the newspapers are misleading. A skilful workman in a good place may get high wages; another with less skill, or in a worse place, may earn very little for the same number of hours' work. It is true that allowances are sometimes made to those who have bad stalls; but even so the difference between the earnings of two men in different pits, or even in different stalls in the same pit, may be very great. In Cumberland, I understand, a practice known as "cavilling" obtains. The stalls are numbered, and there is a ballot taken for them at the beginning of every month or quarter. Here the stalls are apportioned by the managers, and it is believed that kissing goes by favour. Nor is this all. The amount of a miner's earnings depends upon his ability to get tubs, and in some pits unscrupulous men are known to bribe unscrupulous officials, and even the boys employed as drivers, to secure advantages over their fellows. The consequence is that there is often a great deal of discontent amongst the miners, especially amongst the more independent and clean-handed of them.

9. One other source of discontent is the abject poverty which comes from the reckless extravagance of the men. In the *Standard* there have been letters describing the *menu* of a miner's dinner-table, which can only have been evolved out of the writer's imagination. Still, it is the fact that there is much waste in eating, drinking, and gambling. A miner has been known to glory in the prowess of his little boy, not yet two years of age: "He can eat meat like a man." This may be an exceptional case; but it is only one out of innumerable evidences that could be produced of a prevailing and superstitious faith in the merits of an expensive diet. The *Spectator* is, I find, concerned as to the effects of the strike on the constitutions of the children. I should like to be reassuring. It has never been better since I have been here. They have been fed regularly with simple but sufficient and wholesome food in all our schools, and they are quite as vigorous as before the

struggle began. At one period, when the Union funds had been exhausted and relief had not begun to come in, there were not wanting signs of acute distress. But the report of the medical officer of health proves that the rate of mortality, eight per thousand out of a population of twenty-one thousand in this and the adjoining parish of Cannock, has never before been so low as during the month of October, when the men were out of employment and therefore to a very large extent out of the public-houses. Reporters for the Press have drawn graphic pictures of squalid wretchedness in the neighbourhood: if these gentlemen will come here next year, I will undertake to show them in the same quarter scenes of equal misery, unless the magistrates have by that time had the courage to use their now unquestioned powers, or the Legislature has passed some law to restrict temptations to drunkenness. Naturally the poor who are suffering, blame their social superiors. Are they altogether wrong? Is it not amongst their social superiors that we find those who, for the most part, own liquor-stores, license them, and thwart all efforts, not merely to close them, but to let the unfortunate people, whom they ruin, close them for themselves? When the nation has learned the elementary Christian principle that stumbling-blocks ought not to be thrown in the way of human virtue, we shall have more right to condemn unsparingly the intemperance of the miners. It is very prevalent, and drinking and gambling are closely allied.

There are three methods of dealing with handworkers in a free country. (1) They can be corrupted and coerced. The State can give them all facilities for vice, and then, when they are miserable and discontented, it can lock them up or shoot them down. (2) It can convert them all by nationalizing the land, the mines, and the railways, into State officials. This plan is vastly preferable to the first; and assuredly in regard to the coal-mines it will have to be adopted, if the employers and employed endanger by their quarrels the prosperity of the entire country. No nation in its senses would allow all her industries to be at the mercy of two sets of men, who were incapable of working together for the common good. (3) But

I trust that it is not too late to educate the handworkers, to elevate them, to ennoble them, to win them to entire loyalty to their native land by perfect fair dealing. There are amongst them quite enough of true and high-minded men to give one hope that they may all be reached by the influences of civilization, if only the image of gold which has been set up amongst us is cast down, and our blessed Lord becomes instead the acknowledged King of England. We are on the eve, or rather in the midst of a mighty revolution. Dangers manifold, social, moral, and religious, must attend it. The most enlightened statesmanship, the most disinterested devotion to the cause of humanity on the part of all who believe that the Son of man is the Son of God, the greatest wisdom and courage on the part of those whom the industrial classes elect as leaders, will be required to avert national disaster. But the character and conclusion of the recent gigantic struggle give me hope that, when the final issue has been reached, it will not be the shooting of Niagara, but a nearer approach to a "new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness."

"Look forth, the stream behold,
That stream upon whose bosom we have passéd
Floating at ease, whilst nations have effaced
Nations, and Death has gathered in his fold
Long lines of mighty kings : look forth, my soul,
Nor in that vision be thou slow to trust :
Rivers of living waters, less and less by guilt
Stained and polluted, brighten as they flow,
Until they reach the golden city, built
For the perfected spirits of the just."

R. M. GRIER.

THE COAL WAR.

II. LANCASHIRE.

“ I KNOW nothing of the merits of the dispute ; but I hope the men will be beaten.”

These words, spoken to me by a member of “ the classes,” in a railway-carriage, who was unaware that he was addressing a colliery-director, exactly reveal the feelings of that section of society (and of course the coal-owners belong to that section) towards the greatest industrial struggle of the century. The form of the phrase also indicates a sentiment just as wide-spread. It was not “ I hope the masters will win,” but that “ the men will be beaten.” It might be objected that the two phrases mean the same thing ; but to any one who has been at the heart of the fight, and been among the owners before the fight began, there is a difference subtle but significant.

The shadow of this fight was projected over the coal industry many months before the crisis became evident to the public eye. Prices have been slowly gravitating down for the last year or two, and contracting has been going on under the shadow of imminent loss, the escape from which has been always by the same road. When the question has been put by shareholders “ How can you fulfil contracts at such prices ? ” the answer has been, “ We must get wages down.” Until to-day “ wages ” has been the compressible part of the industry ; the part always attacked first. Royalties, fixed salaries, and every other component of the industry have been held sacred—losses have sought their remedy in wages.

And the reason is not far to seek. The freeholder has been protected by the terms of his lease, and he has had the majesty of the law behind him ; fixed salaries belong to those who have

to originate remedies, and it is not in human nature to commence with one's self in such a case of sacrifice. Besides, until organization supplied the strength which belongs to union, the men have been the point where an attack was most likely to succeed. For these reasons among others, the cry in bad times, when low prices rule, has always been, "We must get wages down;" and until the present struggle, even in the mouths of compassionate and fair-minded masters, such a phrase as "a living wage" has never been heard. "We are sorry, but it is an absolute necessity," has been the utterance of even the best masters.

As regards the present war it has been a series of blunders. The demand was put confusedly. I speak with the authority of personal experience, gathered from contact with owners, when I say that the 25 per cent. was understood in many cases, if not in the majority of cases, as being 25 per cent. off the gross total; not as so much reduction of the 40 per cent. advance from the old minimum; or about $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the total earned. When it was said to me, among others, "We must have wages down," I asked "How much?" and was told "25 per cent. Not that at once; but 15 per cent. at first, and then, soon after, a 10 per cent." But I understood this to be from the gross earnings, and so did five out of every six present at the time.

This has been the grand blunder of the campaign. Had 15 per cent. reduction been demanded, the men would have come out, certainly; but in a month they would have been back at work probably with 10 per cent. agreed to as a reduction, and if prices demanded a still further reduction, a fresh demand in the course of a few months would have secured all that was necessary.

Everybody knows that the wages at the time the lock-out began, and at which the men have gone in, until February, are "good times" wages. They can only be paid when coals are at a fairly high price—a *living* price. "A living wage" can only be paid when coals are at a "living price." But who is answerable for such prices as mean loss to masters and starvation to men? Without hesitation I reply, the masters. One of the

largest consumers of coal in London was prepared to pay an agent, from whom I have the information, ninepence per ton more than he ultimately contracted for. He was content to pay it; it would have paid him to pay it: but half a dozen producers, some of them noblemen who are freeholders and consequently pay no royalties, rushed at the buyer, and he used his opportunity to beat down the price. He got his ninepence reduction, but he made the lock-out a necessity—he and others.

But it is also true that greed for cheapness, like vaulting ambition, o'erleaps itself and wins a fall. Since this contract, he has paid, not ninepence, but nine shillings more for his coal. The railway companies and gas corporations who have given way to this greed have suffered, too, in the same way—some of them losing more thousands than their hard terms would have saved them hundreds. It is estimated, and with a fair show of reason, that railways have lost through the lock-out £2,056,565, and the grand total of loss from all trades has been put down at over £33,000,000.

A second blunder, and one less pardonable, perhaps, was the rejection of the terms of the five mayors. Nothing could have been wiser, nothing could have been more desirable than this interposition. As a principle it was much to be preferred to the action of Government, which proved so beneficial. There is nothing we have to fear more than excessive centralization. The less Government touches local questions and actions the better. Mr. Gladstone's interference in time and mode was a true stroke of genius. But if its results should be that Government is henceforth regarded as the court of appeal and the controlling force in trade disputes, then that interference will ultimately be regretted. The action of the five mayors was action in harmony with our national genius, and with the best portion of our past. It was a court of appeal that grew out of the occasion, and which was in intimate touch with the crisis throughout its length and breadth. It proposed the settlement of a quarrel between neighbours by neighbours; and the terms offered were better than those which have been accepted: for unless prices cease to decline—if they decline below the present

mark—the struggle will be renewed in February or next spring. At the time the mayors made their proposal of a smaller reduction, it was exactly suited to the existing conditions of trade, and to conditions which are likely to recur again in spring.

The men, too, have blundered in their tactics. One of the weak points about the coal trade so far as colliery-owners go, is the want of cohesion. A small round table would be big enough to accommodate all owners whose influence need be reckoned with, in most coal-producing districts. Yet even these cannot cohere. In a rising market they can be trusted, but the moment demand begins to weaken, disloyalty to union begins to spread, and secretly if not openly they will violate an agreed scale of prices. During the late struggle the men were far and away more loyal to each other than the masters were: and not from fear of the Union. I know a colliery employing two thousand men where not more than four hundred belong to any Union; yet, when the lock-out began, they flung in their lot with their mates of the Federation, and for seventeen long weeks they starved with them, side by side, not one going in for less than the old rate.

Some masters were willing to work their pits during the greater part of the struggle; and the leaders of the men made the tactical blunder of calling out all workers. This made their own fight harder. It brought thousands more claimants on their funds, it reduced the whole mass of workers to starvation sooner than would otherwise have been the case, and it sent coals up to such a figure that in the case of many of the collieries, this half-year, which contains the period of the lock-out, will show the heaviest profits of any half-year since the coal famine which followed the Franco-Prussian war.

Balance-sheets that would have shown, perhaps, £2000 profit will now show between £25,000 and £30,000. And it strengthened the backs of the masters in the struggle. It made the struggle pay even while it lasted. Hundreds of tons of slack that would never have been gathered were swept up, and sold at famine prices. Waste-heaps were raked for stray coals, and hundreds of sackfuls sold at high prices. The masters

chose the date of the lock-out, and began with vast stocks stacked ; but, in addition, the waste of former years was utilized and sold at high prices. This the men made possible, and it was a very serious blunder—a blunder that will not be repeated.

I wonder if one man in a hundred, nay, in ten thousand, knows what 25 per cent. reduction of wages means, so far as market prices for coal are concerned ? Threepence per ton means 10 per cent. on wages, so that ninepence per ton means 30 per cent. All this struggle has been really about $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. reduction of wages, or rather more than sixpence per ton in price—certainly not ninepence. Thousands of men, women, and children have starved for nearly seventeen weeks in order to get a little more than sixpence per ton off the cost of getting coal ; and many a death will yet take place as a consequence of the struggle.

But the struggle has not been in vain—

“Not in vain,
Even for its own sake, do we suffer pain.”

First : it is now clear that sellers of coal cannot recoup themselves for low prices by compressing wages down to a point at which decent life is impossible. Just as the royalty owner has behind him the majesty of law, and can command the penalties of a Court of Justice to enforce *his* living wage, so the miner has the majesty of public opinion, and the high court of an enlightened national conscience with *its* penalties to enforce his claim. It was grand and cheering during this struggle to see the great heart of England fired with a generous resolve not to let starvation come to the aid of the noble owner and the wealthy worker of the coal-beds in the struggle with the collier. The English nation has many faults, and does things sometimes for which the best among us blush ; but the core is sound—the heart of the nation is healthy. The nation made the conditions of the fight as equal as was possible.

This lock-out, I believe, has slain *ruinous* competition. Prices must now start from the bed-rock of a living wage. The

masters can do what they like with their profits. Those are theirs. But wages are not theirs, and must henceforth be held sacred—sacred as property; they are the poor man's estate. In coal-winning there are three interests, viz. labour, capital, the public needs. And the order of precedence is now fixed on the bed-rock of right—first, labour; second, capital; third, the consumer.

Another gain is the emphatic assertion of the dignity of labour. Carlyle has taught us the dignity of work. Through all the centuries the dignity of capital has been recognized. From the days of Aaron, and before, men have bowed down to the golden calf. To be rich has always been to be respected. "What do you mean by respectability? He kept a gig." *That* has been evident enough for long enough. But until now the dignity of the worker has been denied. When the miners first organized and sent by their officials a letter to the masters, the letter was left unanswered. The masters refused to recognize the right of their workmen to hold communications with them. We have changed all that. To-day masters and workers sit round one table, and form a Board of Conciliation. It is a great step forward, and one whose results will be as beneficial to masters as to men. For the lower to hate the higher is bad; for the higher to despise the lower is bad too. The head cannot say to the hand, "I have no need of thee," nor the hand to the head, "We have no need of each other." A complete whole includes each part, and the absence of any part injures all the rest.

But the grand lesson of the war has been a renewed revelation of the solidarity of labour. During the Dock strike I lived in East London, and daily past my house for weeks I watched the long procession of workless workers stream to the city. It was the saddest procession I ever witnessed—sadder than any funeral. A mile of men three abreast, stark, hollow-cheeked, pale, gaunt, hundreds of them and not a smile amongst them; the faces looked as if they had long forgotten how to smile, and the men grown dumb with hardship. But that strike was the first evidence of what has been perhaps even more apparent in

this coal-war, viz. the solidarity of labour. Then, for the first time, the entire world of labour acted as a coherent whole. It was the most momentous thing of the century. At that crisis the action was satisfactory, because the end sought was right. So it has been this time. If ever labour acts solidly and acts wrongly, we shall have revolution. But I do not think it ever will.

What will eventuate after February no man knows. But of one thing we may be sure, all men have a better right to live than any man has to grow rich. Life is of primal importance; riches are secondary. It is also clear that the horror of great darkness which has so long lain on the toilers is passing away. Often has the cry gone up through the darkness, "Watchman, what of the night?" and often has the sad answer come, "It is night still." But now in the east a great rose of dawn kindles. This kindly, blundering England has come at last to a consciousness of the wrongs of those who work. In the past, the conditions under which those have worked who have created our wealth: the want of sanitation in workshops; the fatal effects of many kinds of labour; the poverty of the pay; the brutality of overseers; the hopelessness of the end, when, as a workman put it to me, "his hair gets the wrong colour;"—these things our nation has never before realized. They have been known, but never *realized*. We are growing wiser. It is now discovered that employer and labourer are the two parties to a bargain of equal benefit to both; and the position of each is of equal honour in itself, and only becomes unworthy when it ceases to be honest. The hand and the head are warm with the same life. Both are vital parts of the body politic. Each needs the other.

JAMES CHADBURN.

EUROPEAN MILITARISM AND AN ALTERNATIVE.

OUT of the discussions on the state of the navy one fact seems to clearly emerge. The Naval Defence Act of 1889, whether necessitated or not, has apparently had an unlooked for result—it has stimulated France and Russia to strenuous efforts of ship-building. We are now, in the name of patriotism, summoned to put forth corresponding efforts in return; while the French papers are already assuring us that, do what we may, France has no intention of being left behind. In other words, Great Britain is being visibly sucked into the general vortex; we are helplessly drifting into the European competition in military armaments; and it may be worth while to look at the present naval scare, not merely from the point of British interests, but as a European event in the light of other European events of the kind.

On last October 1st the new German Army Bill came into force. Once again there was defeat to the facile hopes of those who think that disarmament is possible without some radical change in the constitution of the European system. Twelve months ago we heard that the days of militarism were numbered. The Reichstag would lead the way, and the parliaments of Europe would follow. The question was submitted to a great and intelligent people, speaking by universal suffrage. The peace party could only congratulate themselves that they at least formed a respectable minority. But, after all, the contest was not one-tenth part as severe as the struggle in 1862–3 over the reorganization of the Prussian army. The date of the New Dispensation is just as distant, and the colossal armaments of Europe are a little more colossal than ever.

It is wearisome to hear the adjectives expressive of magnitude exhausted in describing the armies of the Continent. We

want as exact and precise an idea as possible about this economic burden which rests upon the life and the industry of the people. But an unfortunate British civilian in quest of this information soon finds himself out of his depth. He "sweats through the fog" of the technical descriptions of Landwehr and Landsturm; he burdens his memory with the distinction between the "milizia mobile" and the "milizia territoriale," and he gets hazy about the position of the Ersatz reserve. Rival statistics are presented with a pleasing variety, and it is hard for a civilian to find any criterion between them except the instinctive rule of taking the lowest figures which can be found in matters where exaggeration is probable.

One set of facts, however, can be ascertained with little risk of mistake. The military system of the Continent is fairly familiar to every one. We all know roughly the so-called "short service and reserve system," which was borrowed from Prussia by the leading powers, except England, after the wars of 1866 and 1870, and to which the Germans tell us that however disastrous we may think it, England, whether in peace or after defeat, must some day, unless some change arrives, be ultimately forced to come. Let us, however, take a brief glance at the modern institution of the Armed Nation, according to which the armies of the future will be nothing but the nation in arms. For instance, in France, where the system, perhaps, has received its fullest development, the obligation to serve rests in strict law upon every male citizen. There is a fixed and permanent contingent of 540,000 men, known as the Active Army. This is compulsorily recruited each year by successive drafts from the French people. Each Frenchman at the age of twenty is liable for a course of three years' military training in the Active Army. He is then enrolled, according to age, in different categories of reserve, until he reaches his forty-fifth year. So long as he belongs to the Reserves, he remains subject to periodical training for short periods, and under different conditions he is liable to be called out in case of war. Those who from any cause do not go through the three years' training pay a tax for their exemption.

The name of Peace Effective has been in general given to that fixed contingent of men which is called in France the active army; and, as the peace-effectives are precisely regulated in each nation by definite law, it is not difficult to discover exactly how many men are annually withdrawn by the military system of Europe from the civil pursuits of industrial life.

On this point Captain Molard helps us with his book on *La Puissance Militaire des États de l'Europe*. Captain Molard is a terrible fire-eater, formidable even to read with the Channel between us and him. He will not be content with the frontier of the Rhine and the pulverization of Germany. He has also a mortal antipathy to England, which “devrait être pour l'Europe la *delenda Carthago* des Romains.” He must pardon an Englishman in the brief period before he is shortly deleted in welcoming Captain Molard as a collaborateur in the cause of economic science; for his statistics seem trustworthy. His figures are considerably lower than those which are sometimes given by the English peace societies. They agree with the statistics given in the *Statesman's Annual*, or vary from them only in stating a lower total. I therefore quote from Captain Molard's summary of the peace-effectives of the leading Powers and some representative minor states for the years 1869 and 1892:—

	1869.	1892.
France	404,000	540,000
Russia	550,000	812,000
Germany	380,000	510,000
Austria-Hungary	190,000	337,000
Italy	120,000	276,000
England	180,000	220,000
Belgium	25,000	48,000
Greece	11,000	28,000
Roumania	22,000	51,000

Taking the peace-effectives of the nineteen European states together, the conclusion is that, whereas in 1869 the standing armaments of Europe amounted to 2,195,000 men, they amounted in 1892 to 3,240,000 men—an increase of a million in twenty-three years. Or let us say that Europe, for purposes best known to itself, considers it necessary to keep permanently

under arms a force considerably larger than the total population—men, women, and children—of Switzerland; or a force not quite double that of the total population of the kingdom of Norway.

We have seen, then, that after three years' military training, the soldier of the Continent passes into Reserves. If we ask what is the total force which any European state can count upon for use in case of war by drawing upon these Reserves of trained men, the question is far harder to answer. Take the case of Italy—on paper her total forces of all kinds are stated by General Goiran, in *Armies of To-day*, at 2,718,332 men. He thinks she could actually put in the field an army of the 1st line, consisting of 634,000. Sir Charles Dilke, eight years ago, thought she might be able to mobilize half a million of men, while Captain Molard estimates her forces actually ready for use after mobilization at 1,514,300. Similarly the armed forces of Germany have been estimated at anything from two millions and a half up to a total war-effective of 6,000,000, 6,600,000, or even of 7,200,000 men. It is best, perhaps, to take Captain Molard's double estimate of the effectives of European armies on a footing of war:—

	In 1869.	In 1892.	
		On paper: i.e. when the existing recruiting laws have produced their full effect.	Actually ready for use from the moment of mobilization.
France	1,350,000	4,350,000	2,500,000
Russia	1,100,000	4,000,000	2,451,000
Germany	1,300,000 ¹	5,000,000	2,417,000
Austria-Hungary ..	750,000	1,900,000	1,050,000
Italy	570,000	2,236,700	1,514,300
England	450,000	602,600	342,200
Roumania	33,000	280,000	153,000
Belgium	95,000	258,000	128,000
Greece	35,000	180,000	70,000

The conclusion given is that, whereas in 1869 the total number of trained men ready at hand for the war purposes of twenty European states amounted to 6,958,000 men, in 1892 there were actually ready for service 12,564,400; and that, when the

¹ The army of Prussia and the states now forming part of the German empire.

existing laws have had their full effect, there will be 22,621,800 men in Europe trained for war.

It is through statistics such as these that we can partly see the gathering of the thunder-clouds that hang over Europe. Must we not own that they are calculated to stagger a little even the firmest believer in the Infallibility of Democracy and the Inevitability of Progress? Doubtless in the last twenty-five years popular power through the whole of Western Europe has steadily grown and matured. Advance, too, there has been in military matters, but in which direction? Are we being steadily brought by the forward march of civilization towards the condition that was reached by the Italian Republics of the thirteenth century, or the Greek Republics of the fifth? Is it quite absolutely established by experience that democracy can be trusted without further trouble of itself to abolish war?

Before leaving these statistics, it may be well to attempt to get a clearer idea of what a modern army means. Millions leave no impression on the mind, and figures give no picture to the imagination. In the *Nation in Arms*, Lieut.-Col. Baron von der Goltz comes to our rescue. He estimates the German army at two millions and a half of men; and whatever allowance has to be made for the figures of other nations, it is indubitable that Germany could put such a force into the field. Baron von der Goltz tentatively sets the present German army in march upon a single road—say, with four men or three horses abreast. If all the army corps closed up in marching order, rank close on rank, and waggon on waggon, it would extend for a distance of four hundred and fifty miles. Taking the army corps, and the train and paraphernalia together, he finds, to his own and to our astonishment, that, if the head of the column were marching into Maintz, upon the Frankfort road, the last company would only just be leaving Eydtkuhnen, upon the Russian frontier. The whole military road, from the Rhine to the Russian frontier, would be thickly crowded with soldiers, guns, and transports. If these were made to pass out through a single gateway, day and night, it would take a fortnight for all to pass through.¹ It must, of course, be remembered that the

¹ Pages 26, 129.

German army is inferior in size, though not in efficiency, to either the French or the Russian, and only comes third in the list of the armies of the Continent.

It is, perhaps, unnecessary to point out that the possibility of raising these gigantic armies on their war-footing adds little or nothing to the economic burden of militarism. The men who compose the Reserves are engaged in civil pursuits; and the only expenses which they occasion are the cost of manœuvres and administration. But they serve to give an idea how inconceivably terrible will be the loss of life and the waste of wealth in the next European war. It is easy to get at the direct cost of the system of militarism. We have only to take the aggregate of the budgets for the armies and navies of Europe. In 1869, according to another table of figures given in Captain Molard's book, these amounted to £112,000,000 for nineteen states. In 1892 they amounted to a sum nearly double—£198,000,000. Some details of this rise in expenditure will not be without interest.

	1869.	1892.
France	£23,554,116	£34,566,028
Russia	£24,626,428	£49,588,696
Germany	£11,216,700	£28,084,840
Austria-Hungary	£9,103,232	£15,722,496
Italy	£7,070,040	£14,484,176
England	£24,227,000	£33,190,000
Belgium	£1,475,400	£2,046,232
Roumania	£721,912	£1,534,220
Switzerland	£103,488	£1,810,140

- But, then, this is by no means the whole cost of the military system. We have seen that, at the present moment, there are in Europe 3,240,000 men withdrawn from productive industry. They are, of course, physically the flower of Europe, for the unfit are not called upon to serve. What the consequent indirect loss to Europe may be, can only be roughly indicated. Mr. Giffen, in a well-known article on the cost of the Franco-German war, estimates the average earning power of a man at £40 a year. If we may take this as the basis of calculation, we see that as part of the indirect cost of the system we must

count another £129,600,000. This, of course, does not by any means exhaust the waste of productive labour; but we may say that the total yearly cost, direct or indirect, is certainly far more than £328,500,000. In Mr. Giffen's article, to which we have just alluded, the total cost of the Franco-German war to both countries is given provisionally at £546,000,000. And thus we arrive at the singular conclusion that Europe spends during every twenty months of what it is pleased to call peace an outlay equal to the total expense, both direct and indirect, of the Franco-German war.

How unbearable the burden is becoming in the poorer states like Italy; how it is the real root of the opposition to Free Trade, and the reaction towards Protection which is in process on the Continent; how it is the prolific source of Nihilism and Anarchy, and the more explosive form of Socialism; how, in that intricate complex of questions which we call the social problem, the solution of the peace-question becomes the indispensable condition for the complete success of many other social reforms, there is no need to point out at length. It is an obvious way, however, to test the economic strain of the system by reference to the growth of the national debts, of which "by far the greater part," according to Sir J. Lubbock's recent speech in the House of Commons, "has been thrown away on war, or in preparation for war." During the last twenty years, the debt of Italy has risen from £483,000,000 to £516,000,000, that of Austria from £340,000,000 to £580,000,000, that of Russia from £340,000,000 to £750,000,000, and that of France from £500,000,000 to £1,300,000,000. No European debt has been reduced except those of Holland and England, while France has succeeded in distancing us, and in producing the greatest debt that is on record in the history of the world.

It is, of course, often said that this rivalry of indebtedness must lead to repudiation. But, perhaps, there is a more serious source of danger in the future competition between the United States of America and the disunited States of Europe. It was recently stated in the *Manchester Guardian* that certain German firms at the Chicago Exhibition, feeling it inequitable that they

should be handicapped in the race of commerce by the German system of State-insurance for workmen from which the United States are free, were trying to bring home to the American business world the many merits of that institution. We all know how slight a handicap may decide the advantage in the fierce competition for the neutral markets of the world. According to Mr. Bryce there are those now living who will see the United States with a population equal to that of the eighteen states of Western Europe: as the young Giant of the West comes to its full stature, is it a rash speculation that armaments amounting to three millions of men, and national debts amounting to a total sum of 5,000 million pounds, may just suffice to turn a trembling scale? And it must be remembered that the United States, which has reduced its debt from £556,000,000 in 1860 to £180,000,000 in 1893, maintains over an area larger than the whole of Europe an army somewhat smaller than that of the kingdom of Greece. Even now the competition would be seriously felt, were it not that the States choose to throw away the wealth of their inexhaustible resources on a high protective tariff and the scandals of their pension-list. If American reformers do succeed in clearing these abuses, they may strike the sword out of our hand by leaving Western Europe to the simple alternative of deciding whether it is least disagreeable to become a confederate democracy or a wreck, for the competition of commerce would then become as ridiculous as a race between a medieval knight in chain armour and battle-axe, and a modern professional runner in flannels. In the phrase of Cobden, we shall be forced "to turn moralist in self-defence."

It is, of course, to be noted that the figures of militarism given above do not represent anything final. They are a mere moment in a general process. We may wonder how it comes about that the people of Europe has consented to the development of these portentous armies in the different states, just as travellers have sometimes wondered how the enormous masses of masonry in an Egyptian temple have been raised from the ground. It has been suggested by some authorities on Egyptian

architecture that the work was done by the method of "joggling." A block of stone would be put between scaffolding, and tilted from beneath, first on one side, and then on the other, till the whole rose high in the air. Whether this be the true explanation or not—and I am profoundly ignorant in the matter—it is certain that there is a similar "joggling" process, which has raised and is still raising the armaments of Europe. One of the trio of camps, into which Europe is divided, feels it safer to make some slight increase to its forces. From the same motives of self-defence, the move is soon answered by a corresponding increase on the part of its rival. The relative situation of both Powers towards each other remains unchanged; the economic burden on both peoples has been equally increased, "and we call Peace this state of effort of all against all." Let us look, for instance, at the increase of the peace-effective in Germany, which has steadily risen side by side with the growth of the forces of Russia and France. It was fixed in 1871 by the military law of the Empire at 401,659 non-commissioned officers and men. In April, 1881, it rose to 427,274; in April, 1887, to 468,409; in October, 1891, to 486,983. It has not been raised for the last time in 1893. So, again, the Austro-Hungarian Government, in the estimates for 1894, announced that it would need an extra military expenditure of 4,002,000 florins, and that in future, for a period of some years, there would be required successive additions of money for the supply of repeating rifles and smokeless powder, new guns, and an increase of fortifications, and more horses and men. Already we have read in the newspapers the announcement that France and Russia intend to augment their forces in response to the German Army Bill. The smaller States of Europe get engulfed in the same stream; Sweden, for instance, raised her military budget last year. Nor can we hope that Great Britain, by vainly uttering the shibboleth of Non-interference, can really abstract itself from the general tendencies of that European world in which we live and have our being; for in the days of railways and telegraphs nations cannot live in watertight compartments. We have apparently exhausted the benefit of the considerable increase made

to our military forces by the late Government. By the Imperial Defence Act of 1888, three millions had to be spent on the communications of the Empire; and we are now told, on all hands, that the navy imperatively needs more than the £20,000,000 which, under the Naval Defence Act of 1889, was to be spent on the fleet between 1889 and 1894; for, as we all know, the fleets of the various nations are increasing just as much as their armies.

So long, then, as Europe remains organized on the national basis, where, when, and how is this upward "joggling" process to be stopped? Mr. Labouchere says that "the Radical policy . . . is to have an army and navy sufficient for defence, but not for aggression."¹ But if a neighbouring nation chooses to raise its forces by one-quarter, the question at once arises whether the former army and navy is now really adequate for defence; if not, the Radical policy would be to raise the army and navy in return. Such, at least, seems to be the explanation of the mental attitude of Germany in the recent elections, and the reasoning by which the Emperor has forced the hand of a reluctant people. The risks of being unprepared are very great, and the stakes very heavy. On the lowest of grounds, it would financially pay to accept half a dozen new Army Bills rather than suffer a defeat like that of France in 1871. They may lead us, and not impossibly will, to eventual ruin; but what if the choice seems to lie between that and the risk of immediate destruction? In face of this well-nigh irresistible tendency, which we see to be the direct outcome of the national system in Europe, a member of the peace party ventures to submit that a policy of mere blind irreconcilable hostility to the army estimates is doomed to failure, unless it be accompanied by a constructive attempt to alter the national system. We have been treating the symptoms and neglecting the cause of the disease. However reasonless the motive power, and however ruinous the result, the war budgets are bound inevitably to rise throughout Europe, do what we will, unless we can discover some practical policy by which we can, if not eradicate,

¹ "The Foreign Policy of England," *North American Review*, October, 1892.

at least effectually control, the groundless jealousy and suspicion and ignorant dislike felt by one part of the people of Europe to another part, which eats and drinks and marries and is surprisingly human and like ourselves on the other side of an invisible line of political frontier.

Whether the view here taken be right depends upon the opinion that may be formed about the cause of this amazing progress of militarism. We may discard the old idea of Cobden and Bright that the army was "nothing but a gigantic system of outdoor relief for the junior members of the aristocracy;" and this was at the root of their belief that popular government of itself would abolish war. Purchase in the army is a matter of history. The old power of the aristocracy has vanished with a wider suffrage; and in the disguised democracy of England, just as much as in the unveiled republic of France, the army estimates are bigger than ever. Nor is there more plausibility in a view expressed a little while ago by Mr. John Burns in Hyde Park, that "it was fear of the labour party of Europe that led the Governments to arm." This seems to rest on a misconception of the system of the armed nation; you do not put repeating rifles into the very hands of the people whom you most distrust and dread. Captain Molard thinks that it is all due to the Alsace-Lorraine question, and marshals his figures accordingly. But unfortunately for this view, the process began before the Alsace-Lorraine question was ever heard of. It is really from about 1848 that the advance became marked. The following table gives a few details to illustrate this advance:—

	Total Army, ¹ in 1854.	Total Army ² in 1859.	Total Army ³ in 1869.
France	567,200	640,540	1,350,000
Austria	593,000	634,400	750,000
Germany (Prussia and Germanic Confederation) }	804,000	836,800	1,300,000
Great Britain	230,200	245,800	450,000

¹ Figures taken from *Tableau Recapitulatif des Forces Militaires*, published in 1854, "par un officier Allemand."

² From *Journal of the Prussian Statistical Bureau*, quoted in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

³ From Captain Molard.

It was in 1848 that the spirit of nationality first showed its great hold over the Continent. It is to this ultimate cause, I venture to suggest, that the modern advance of militarism is mainly due. By the spirit of nationality I do not, of course, refer to the reasonable desire of any section of a nation to have a measure of self-government in the conduct of its own affairs. That is a distinct question with which I am not concerned. The real evil lies in the separate existence of eighteen independent sovereignties in Western Europe living in incessant rivalry or hostility to each other, and subject to no joint controlling power. However much we desire to feel and cultivate an enlightened patriotism towards our own country, no one who looks at Europe as a whole can fail to see the grave and multiplied dangers which flow inevitably from its organization on the principle of nationality. It was from 1848, then, that the several states felt an intensified consciousness of their national existence, and the evil spirit of nationalism re-entered with power into the people of Europe, and drove it, at first steadily, and now with accelerated force, towards the abyss. It is true that the tendency has been intensified since 1870; for that year saw the almost final completion of a stage of development, which began on the Continent some four hundred years ago. That stage is the evolution of the Nation; and it is time that we saw more clearly the need of working for wider forms of political association unless the good consequences of that evolution (which need not be dwelt upon, for no one is likely to ignore them), are to be far outbalanced by the bad. "So long as the nations are independent," says Moltke, in the *Franco-German War*, "so long there will be war;" which is eminently sensible and wise, and an excellent reason for cutting the nations' claws. The more we are able, whether inside the British Empire or on the wider sphere of the Continent, to induce the nations to consent, through the application of the federal principle, to a voluntary surrender of a certain portion of their independence for the better security of the larger remainder, the more we shall approach, not to the abolition of war, but to a progressive limitation of the area in which there is a possibility of its occurrence.

For there are here and there to be found a few individuals deluded enough to believe with Professor Henry Sidgwick ¹—

“that a federation of West European States, at least, with a common government sufficiently strong to prevent fighting among those states, is not beyond the limits of sober conjecture as to the probable future course of political development.”

They believe with the Bishop of Durham, that—

“we are reaching out to yet another change, through which the nations of Western Europe would be united in a close confederation, and continue to bring all the resources which they have gathered to the service of the race.”

The idea has, of course, often been suggested, and is anything but new; all that is new is the changed conditions of modern Europe, which have converted the utopia of the past into an ideal of the future. It is the germ of truth, contained in that not over-fortunate phrase, “The United States of Europe.” It is the creed of the social Democratic party in Germany; it was adopted as an ideal by the two last Peace Congresses at Rome and at Berne; and, apart from the names of past theorists, there are men of some prominence living in most European states who have expressed their adherence to it. They think that arbitration, however urgently needed, is but the starting-point, and not the goal. It is to them but the germ of a Supreme Court in Europe, to be invested with powers of judicial, though not military, coercion in a manner precisely similar to that devised by the authors of the Supreme Court in America. They believe that we must treat in a permanent, regular, and organized way, through a European Parliament, those subjects which are now *mis*-managed in a partial, spasmodic, and ill-organized fashion by Congress and Conference and the Concert of Europe. Moreover, the institution of a Federal Council in Europe, on the lines of the existing Federal Council of Australasia, might turn out to be a valuable piece of machinery for the working out of the international Labour programme. They hold that experience proves that joint international action in Europe is the best way to regulate and overrule the individual

¹ In the *Elements of Politics*, p. 209.

selfishness of single nations with a view towards at least a partial approximation to the Common Good. They are convinced that collective co-operation of the people of Europe, with a view to common ends, is the sole way of breaking down the prejudices born of ignorance, the jealousies and misunderstandings bred of error, and the antipathies due to isolation, which are the underlying causes of advancing militarism. May we not take a hint from the Swiss and American Commonwealths, and come to an international understanding about our armaments? We may not be able at once to diminish our armies and navies. Even the Zurich Conference seems to have shrunk from proposing that. Can we not, at least, agree to arrest their increase?

All this, of course, is good enough for a mere theorist, or a political philosopher, or a humanitarian thinker with an eye for an ideal. But to practical men the Unity of Western Europe will seem inexpressibly absurd. Practical men will feel that it is written in the Book of Nature, and that it is a law of the Medes and Persians, that no State in Western Europe should be more than two hundred thousand square miles. It is true that steam and the telegraph have been able to weld into one by means of the federal principle two Commonwealths—covering each twice the *area* of Western Europe—across the seas. But what is the use of the railway in Europe but to build eight parallel strategic lines running out to the political frontier? And what is the good of better means of communication except to enable a State to bring thirty army corps, each made up of thirty thousand men, on to a theatre of war vastly wider than has ever before been conceived? Practical men will point to the obvious practical difficulties. But the main obstacles in the way are those which the Federalists of all ages have had to surmount. It may be doubted whether they are more insuperable than those which faced the patriots of Germany in 1815.

“I consider,” says M. Jules Simon, “that the Federation of Europe, with its railways and telegraphs, would not be more ridiculous than was the federation of the United States of America.”¹

¹ From *Nouvelle Revue Internationale*, Jan., 1891.

Besides, the practical man will urge, of course, that the most approved method of inspiring love for one's next-door neighbour is to cultivate hatred for your next-door neighbour but one; and war is the teacher of all the gentler feelings; and the chance of shooting your fellow-creatures is the best school for unselfishness and consideration for others; and life is much elevated by the ethics of the barracks. Moreover, as M. Zola has recently pointed out, war is the best of all means for bracing the character with a dash of refreshing idealism, and without it the world would die of materialism, and of reading M. Zola's novels.

Indeed, the arguments of practical politicians on these subjects have such force and cogency as to be wholly convincing to the unprejudiced mind. So let us leave them to enjoy their intellectual victory; and to the serene and undisturbed contemplation of such achievements as the creation of five thousand millions of National Debts, the organization of armies amounting to three millions of men, and to the probability in the next half century, as in the last, of leaving the bones of a million of men on the battlefields of Europe. Let us leave it all to the merciless drift of events, and the guidance or the non-guidance of the politicians. It is probable that things must be worse before they can be better, and it is my unshaken conviction that of that the politicians will take excellent care.

CHARLES ROBERTS.

NOTES AND MEMORANDA.

AN EXPERIMENT IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN A VILLAGE. — Winterslow is a large scattered village on the top of the Wiltshire Downs, consisting of detached hamlets which had a certain mutual rivalry. The County Councillor is a country gentleman who lives outside the district, and, in fact, in another county ; but he is our next neighbour, and has always been interested in the parish. He calls himself a Conservative, but he is full of Liberal ideas, and makes quite a hobby of everything connected with Local Government and the development of village life. He holds what he calls the Chinese ideal with reference to the family, believing in family councils and in the education of the elder children by consulting them in every family matter. He was elected to the County Council on the first occasion chiefly through the votes of Winterslow, when he polled nearly every vote on the register : at the last occasion he was re-elected without a contest, being, in fact, proposed by his previous rival, who declared that we could not have a better man.

About two years ago he started a "Village Committee," based on the old Saxon idea of "the Tithing," as he called it. We have about 190 families (omitting solitary widows) ; these were grouped in tens, and each ten was invited to meet and appoint a committee man. On the first occasion this was done at a tea given by our Councillor, when he explained fully the objects of the meeting. Nineteen were thus chosen : the schoolmaster became their chairman ; the Rector was asked to preside, but, though he fully sympathized with the movement, he declined. The members represented every variety of the village life, including a leading farmer, a carpenter, a blacksmith, a wood-merchant, several labourers, etc. They chose a Subcommittee, representing the various hamlets, and this is consulted by the County Councillor before each meeting of the County Council. Various questions as to roads, lighting, nuisances, etc., are brought before this Subcommittee, or the General Committee, and by them representations are made to the proper authority.

The local member of the Highway Board is on the Committee, and the Rector, who is Guardian of the Poor and a member of the Rural

Sanitary Authority, does his best to give weight to the representations of the Committee. A legacy of £20 was left to the Rector and Churchwardens to distribute in coal among the poor; they asked the Committee to prepare a list of names, and this delicate business was discharged most successfully. They have also given most useful help in amending the yearly list for Christmas doles of coals and bread. The school-managers wanted to enlarge their number and set the schools on a more popular basis. The Committee chose four additional school-managers (not exclusively from its own body), and this choice has proved a most successful one. The workings of the Committee have done much to remove the previous rivalry between the hamlets, and also political antipathies which previously existed. The Councillor gives a yearly dinner which draws the Committee closer together. On one occasion Sir John Gorst came to interview the Committee, and all his questions were most intelligently answered.

The most interesting development of the work of the Committee has been in connection with a farm which the County Councillor bought as an experiment in small holdings. The farm contained 190 acres: 80 of these were sold to a single farmer, but the rest has been divided into lots varying from half an acre to five or seven acres, and apportioned for sale among the villagers. The system of payment is by yearly instalments of interest and principal combined, spread over fifteen years in half-yearly payments, though any lot can be bought up at a fixed scale, any year.

The owners form a "Landholders' Court, Limited," which has the duty of collecting tithe and rates, and of giving consent to alienations and buildings on the lots, and which has also the power of investing the profits, after the original purchaser has been duly paid, in any objects intended to benefit the estate as a whole. The land was very soon taken up, and as yet the half-yearly payments have been most punctually made, and a good deal has been done to improve the land, much of which was rather neglected. The Committee decided on the selling value of each separate lot, according to its position and its soil; it authorized the construction of necessary roads and footpaths, and appointed a secretary who arranged for the actual transfers and title-deeds. This interesting experiment was rendered more easy by the very cheap rate at which the property was bought—less than £8 per acre for the freehold—and by the generosity of the County Councillor, who refused to make any profit at all on the transaction, simply taking a small interest and the repayment of his actual expenses. On the other hand, the trying season which we have just passed through has made it harder for the new owners than they might fairly have expected.

There is one special feature in the social conditions of Winterslow which helps this land movement. A large number of the people work in the woods in winter, and have much spare time in summer for their own ground, even though they may go off for some distance at the actual harvest time. The work in the woods seems to foster a certain independence and self-reliance that one does not see in every Wiltshire village: a good many of the holders are teetotalers, and there has been much thrift among them for years. A few possess horses, others borrow from the small farmers for ploughing purposes. Most till the land, but a few use the smaller holdings as a poultry run. The same County Councillor started a pig-insurance club some years ago, which has been very successful, and has much stimulated the purchase and rearing of pigs by the villagers. A cow club was also attempted, but too few joined to make it permanently feasible, and it was found very hard to arrange a combination with the neighbouring villages.

The experiments that have been already made seem to show that the larger country village, even though much scattered and wanting any central nucleus, is still quite capable of self-government and, in the direction of its own local affairs, can sink all political and religious differences. One flaw in the system is that we cannot secure all the ablest or most popular men, as, of course, only one is available from every group of ten. This might be remedied by making every thirty families elect three members, with perhaps a representative for the minority. The only drawback in the actual working of the measure has been the want of work which the committee had legally power to perform. All the members now look forward with interest to the Parish Councils Bill, and their training has made them singularly capable to serve well on such a Council when it is appointed. Our County Councillor is setting up similar committees in the other villages of his district, but none are so fully developed as that which has been described.

R. EWING.

PROFIT-SHARING IN AGRICULTURE.—In the January number of the *Economic Review* for 1892 there appeared a note on Mr. Albert Grey's profit-sharing experiment, as practised on his Northumberland farm, East Learmouth. This note contained the main outlines of the scheme, and gave an account, founded on an address which Mr. Grey delivered to his labourers on October 30, 1891, of the practical result of the undertaking after a trial of five years.

Shortly before Mr. Grey delivered this address, West Learmouth had been included in the scheme; and since then the two farms,

embracing 1763 acres, have been treated as one. Thus joined they employ forty hands and a manager. The hands include 2 stewards, 4 shepherds, 2 spademen—*i.e.* hedgers and ditchers—4 odd boys, 14 hinds, and 14 women. The last bonus paid—6½ per cent. on the wage earned, out of nett profits, after deductions had been made for Reserve and Management—was for the year ending May 12, 1891. Since then the agricultural depression has been so severe that only the interest on capital, 4 per cent.—the first charge on the farm,—the wages, and the rent, have been made; so no accounts have during that time been published, and therefore our view of the matter is necessarily confined to its moral rather than to its financial aspect.

Mr. Grey's object in starting the undertaking seems to have been threefold, *viz.* to benefit himself, to benefit the labourers, and, by his example, to benefit society at large. The benefit to himself consisted in maintaining the rent, which the last tenant at East Learmouth considered too high, and which—an abatement having been refused—was the cause of his giving it up. The possible money-benefit to the labourers was obvious; but above, though joined to that, he aimed at the moral benefit, born of self-interest. In other words, he wished to set in motion the thinking apparatus, and so place his men on a different footing from his cart-horses. As for the benefit to society, it would be assured if profit-sharing could be brought within the range of practical, *i.e.* paying, affairs.

Let us now see how far these objects are being attained. As it has already been said, the rent and the interest on capital have been regularly paid; and, beyond that, Mr. Grey says that he enjoys the rights of proprietorship far more fully than if the farms were leased to a tenant. With regard to himself, then, he has so far been successful. But in considering the view the hinds take of the question, we must bear in mind three things. First, the comparative affluence enjoyed by the north-country labourer, as contrasted with his less fortunate brethren, both in the South of England and abroad. Secondly, the custom of frequently "flitting" from one farm to another. And thirdly, that though the majority of them are Radical in their opinions with regard to the affairs of others, they are essentially Conservative with regard to their own. In fact, in connection with any agricultural innovation, a thing has only to be new to be condemned. The men are hired from the 12th of May one year to the same date in the next. The regular wage is from 15s. to 16s. a week, and this is paid irrespective of illness or holidays. Added to this is a free house and garden, twelve hundred yards of potatoes—value about £5,—and coals carted free of charge. Women are not bound, but are simply paid for

their actual day's work ; and, in a large family, sometimes a man or two has to go on these terms also. A woman's wage is from 1s. 3d. to 1s. 6d. a day, with 3s. a day for twenty days during harvest, and the estimation her work is held in is exemplified by the fact that a family with only men workers finds it much more difficult to get employment. In spite of this, when a man and woman worker are wanted on a farm, the traditional inequality of the sexes is demonstrated by a "double-hind" being advertised for. Now, at this rate of remuneration, it is easy to see what a capital income many households enjoy. For instance, a family in which there are four men and three women workers will be in receipt of considerably over £200 a year ; and this is no uncommon thing.

With such an income as this, joined to their other privileges, they may, with care and thrift, eventually become sufficiently substantial capitalists to enter a small farm themselves. This often actually happens : indeed, the tenants of five farms on end, all within seven or eight miles of East Learmouth, are men who have risen from the position of hinds and shepherds. This, then, is naturally the ultimate ambition of the pick of the labouring class ; and with this aim in view, profit-sharing has not the same attraction for them, for they at best would only regard it as a stepping-stone to something better. The custom of yearly "fitting" is so common, that the 12th of May,—the day on which the moving is done—is regarded on all Northumbrian farms as virtually a *dies non*. The cause of the custom may be attributed chiefly to a natural desire for change of some sort, in a life which is characterized by monotony. Besides this, there is of course always a chance that some have to go because others do, it being a question of the family not fitting the farm under the altered conditions. Or it may be that the family outgrows the farm, or has to leave because of the misconduct of a member of it. But from whatever cause they leave, the fact that they do so is bound to detract in some degree from the success of a profit-sharing farm. Continuity of service being uncertain, the same high standard of work cannot be expected as would be the case if the employment were life-long. Another result of this uncertainty would be that a labourer who came into the farm after a succession of bad years would not work with the same incentive, knowing that, whatever the profits might be, they would go to pay past deficits in the way of rent and interest on capital, and that when it was possible again to distribute bonuses he would probably be gone, and some one else would reap the advantage.

Then, if Conservatism is chiefly a mixture of caution and scepticism, there is nothing on earth so Conservative as the Northumbrian hind.

For example, if you ask any of the men on either of the Learmouths, or on any farm near enough to be brought into contact with them, what they think of the scheme, you are almost invariably met with a half shamefaced or sceptical smile, and probably all the answer you get to your inquiry is: "O! dar say it is varrie gude." At the most all the acknowledgment they would make would be: "Ay, but it's a fine thing to get two or three pound extra at the end o' the year. It comes in gey handy." Only in exceptional cases can you get anything more definite. One intelligent man, who had not lived on the Learmouths himself but had been brought into contact with men who had, told me that he thought the prospect of possible gain coupled with the half-holiday which was given to the men for several years but has lately been withdrawn, did give the Learmouths the pick of the labour market, and consequently did insure that excellence of work on which Mr. Grey justifies his principle of taking all the loss and sharing the profits. But this opinion, even among the working class, is in a decided minority.

Society, as represented by the neighbouring farmers, is not in love with the scheme. They say that work is no better done on the Learmouths than on any other farm. They say, too, that a good farmer would no more expect to share with others the profits which result from his knowledge, experience, and intelligence than he would the interest on his capital. What, they ask, will happen if the Learmouths get eight or ten bad years in succession. And, whilst it lasted, they with almost one voice condemned the half-holiday.

The half-holiday was not in the hiring contract, but it was an understood thing that they should have it when it was possible. Of course, in very busy times, such as hay-making and harvest, they did not expect it.

In spite of the mass of adverse criticism on this subject, there are yet some who, knowing how long are the hours of the agricultural labourer, can only regret that, after a fair trial, Mr. Grey has found it necessary on this point to come into line with public opinion. It is, to say the least, unfortunate to find that experience shows that it is inexpedient to grant to a man who is engaged in one of the most monotonous and laborious of pursuits the relaxation which has been found beneficial both to the work and to the workmen in so many other callings. With regard to the possible eight or ten bad years, Mr. Grey has provided against such a contingency by arranging that, "if the gross profits for any one year should fail to pay rent and interest on capital, the deficit must be made good out of the nett profits of succeeding years, before any bonus can be distributed."¹

¹ "Profit-sharing in Agriculture," by Albert Grey, *Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society of England*, vol. ii., 3rd series, pt. iv.

But perhaps the objection which is most frequently raised is this : that a system is unpractical which allows workmen to share the profits and does not require them to share the losses also. The remark in reference to this is constantly heard : " Oh ! it's a fine thing for the labourers ! with them it's a case of ' Heads, I win ; tails, you lose.' " In answer to this, Mr. Grey maintains that, inasmuch as the employees put a better class of work into the farm, they are losers to that extent when no bonus is forthcoming. Whether this is so or not, no man can be expected to share the loss when he has no voice in the management. There is no doubt that under present conditions it would be impossible to let him have a voice in the management ; but, in consequence of this, there is inevitably more or less flavour of arbitrary philanthropy about the system.

If, then, imitation is a test of success, Mr. Grey's aim with regard to society cannot be said to have been attained. But, for all that, the world at large is indirectly benefited in spite of itself, by profit-sharing or any system of bonus-paying. This is cleverly demonstrated by Mr. Grey himself, in the address already alluded to :—

" You will, in your reading of the newspapers, have often come across the remark, that it is an anomaly monstrous and indefensible that you householders, who pay no rates, should have the power, if you like to use it, of rating the owners to any extent you please. When one class imposes the taxes and another pays them, you have all the conditions required for the production of injustice, turmoil, and discontent. Now, watch how our principle comes in and puts this right. You on the farm are as closely interested as any occupier or owner in the economy of local administration ; or rather, I should say, more deeply interested, for the pressure of the rate falls more heavily on you, in proportion to your income, than it does on men of greater means. This will be evident to you when I point out that if the rates upon the farm had been as high for the year ending May 12th, 1891, as they were during the first year of our occupation, we should have been called upon to pay to the rate-collector £45 more than we have paid. In other words, the profits would have been reduced by the sum of £45, and consequently there would have been—

£11 5s. less to reserve.

£11 5s. less to management.

£11 5s. less to capital.

£11 5s. less to labour.

i.e. instead of Robert Kemp being entitled on his wage of £50 to a bonus of £3 4s., he would only have received £2 8s., or, in other words,

he would have been taxed 16s. on his income of £53 4s.—an income tax of nearly 4d. in the £.”¹

Now, in reviewing the whole scheme, it soon becomes apparent that whatever anomalies arise are due to restricted co-operation. Mr. Grey told his labourers, in 1891, that he considered the present agricultural relations between labour and capital pre-eminently adapted for transforming a man into an automaton, and he hoped and wished to reverse the process. But to effect this desirable consummation the only motive power as yet called into play by his experiment is self-interest; add to this responsibility, and the man is made. Northumberland, with its intelligence, thrift, and high wages, is a veritable seed-bed for co-operation, and if Mr. Grey's enterprise is the first step towards combination on the part of those labourers who have it in them to rise to the position of tenants, or even perhaps proprietors, the automaton's days are numbered. It is encouraging, then, to know that Mr. Grey does not confine his profit-sharing system to the Learmouths, but that several other farms are being worked on the same principle, 3,765 acres being the entire area affected by the scheme.

A. LEO CHIPMAN.

THE BIRMINGHAM CHURCH CONGRESS, OCTOBER, 1893.—The Church Congress this year devoted two afternoon meetings to the discussion of social and labour problems. On Wednesday, October 4th, we met to hear Mr. A. Chance, Sir W. Houldsworth, the Rev. the Hon. J. G. Adderley, Archdeacon Wilson, Alderman Philips, and others, discuss the mutual attitude of employers and employed, and the relation of the clergy to either of these two great classes. On the following afternoon, the Head of the Oxford House (in the place of the Bishop of Bedford), Mr. Lytton Gell, Mr. Edward Clifford, the Rev. E. Hoskyns, Canon Quirk, and others dealt with such subjects as the Housing of the Poor, Labour Homes, Relief, Thrift and Provision for the Aged, etc.—subjects whose real importance could only be measured by application of the principles discussed at the former meeting. In view of the limited range of the “Labour and Social Questions” brought before the Congress, it may be well to remark that it is a dangerous fallacy to suppose that the social problem may be resolved into a mere question of master and man. Modern economic investigation, *pace* Sir William Houldsworth, clearly shows that the ultimate solution of the industrial problem is a matter quite as much in the hands of the consumers as in those of the two classes of producers.

¹ Address by Mr. Albert Grey to the labourers on East Learmouth Farm, Oct. 30, 1891.

The speeches at the Thursday meeting illustrate very well the two different ways of viewing social questions, one or other of which the majority of Churchmen, consciously or unconsciously, tend to adopt. Speakers of the worthy type of Mr. Chance, Sir W. Houldsworth, and Mr. Robert Bartleet, seem to regard philanthropy as the last word of reform. Sir William Houldsworth's speech was in the main just the sort of oration one might have expected from an honest and kindly-minded disciple of John Stuart Mill—though hardly from Mill himself. "The fact is," we were assured, "that wages are the price of labour, and the price of any commodity can only be ascertained by what economists call the 'higgling of the market.'" Even under our present industrial system, we very much doubt whether this statement really represents facts. Sir William spoke of the diversion of capital into other channels. This, of course, may be a real danger; but the argument is beside the point when we are discussing whether the enterprise in which it is at present employed is or is not carried on by an immoral system of remuneration.

From a similar point of view, Mr. Chance's speech was equally instructive. He expressly left the discussion of the real matter at issue to "be dealt with by other papers," laying down as a Christian axiom that "the mere payment of wages due for services rendered is not the sum-total of all he (i.e. the master) owes to those whom he employs." But, as Alderman Philips reminded the meeting, the real donors of working-men's institutes, libraries, clubs, etc., are often those whose inadequate wages enable their employer to pose in the charming rôle of philanthropist. We have to be just before we can be generous.

On the other side, the social question was placed before the meeting as a question of justice rather than of charity (in the limited sense of the term) by the Rev. the Hon. J. G. Adderley, and successive speakers, including Archdeacon Wilson and Alderman Philips, Canon Leigh and Prebendary Grier, who perhaps suffered from having to follow Mr. Adderley's extraordinarily brilliant invective, the apparent exaggeration of which was in no small degree due to the necessity of getting as much as could be said in several hours into a speech of twenty minutes.

The great speech of the Thursday afternoon meeting was undoubtedly that of the Head of the Oxford House. A somewhat exaggerated optimism in tone was perhaps the result of Canon Leigh's pessimistic declaration on the previous afternoon; but although Mr. Ingram was speaking rather in the rôle of a private observer than as Head of the Oxford House, the Congress was prepared to receive encouragement when coming from so competent an authority. Canon Quirk's interest-

ing speech on old-age pensions would in all probability have called forth greater enthusiasm had it been read at the Folkstone instead of the Dover Congress. Under existing circumstances, it was fairly generally felt that the question of capacity for thrift must be answered before we can get to work at its organization. And, lastly, Canon Knox-Little appeared as a sort of *advocatus diaboli* against the socialist clergyman. The parish priest, he contended, could not and perhaps ought not, to understand the quarrels (often of a highly technical nature) between master and men. With this ascription of ignorance to the clergy, it is at least interesting to compare the opinion of the greatest living authority on the conditions of the life of the poor. It was only last year that Mr. Charles Booth expressed it as his deliberate opinion that social reformers would be profoundly unwise if they looked at the poor through any other spectacles than those of the parish priest.

Before concluding this notice, I should like to call attention to the speech of Mr. Robert Bartleet on the matter of the employment of women. Mr. Bartleet's description of the rules observed in his own factories commanded our deep respect, but we fail to see how a scheme, demanding such self-sacrifice on the employer's part, can be placed before the consideration of "higglers in the market."

WALTER K. FIRMINER.

LABOUR QUESTIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Since my notes on this subject in the last July number of the *Economic Review* were written, very little has been reported of the doings of the Labour Commission to which I referred, but the Commission itself has been reconstituted. It consisted originally of five members carefully selected; but the Ministry resigned in May, and the new Ministry, still under Mr. Rhodes as Prime Minister, is more completely subservient than was the former to the Afrikaner Bund. This association consists mainly of Dutch farmers, whose organization is directed towards the preservation of the Cape Dutch language and Dutch supremacy generally—a conservative or even retrograde policy, and one which would return to the more than patriarchal rule of former days in the colony. The Bund passed a resolution requesting the Government to add two more members to the Commission chosen from their own party, and to this the Government meekly submitted. Mr. Faure, the former chairman of the Commission, resigned his post on being appointed Resident Magistrate of Capetown, and his place was taken by Mr. Herholdt, M.L.A. Another secession from their number was that of Mr. Molteno, a member who had done good service in the earlier sittings by his minute cross-examination on the drink question: he resigned because, in his opinion (with which I

concur), the Commission as reconstituted was unlikely to make the investigation one of any value.

The sittings of the Commission were resumed in October. So far as the evidence has been reported from the country centres where they have sat, scarcity of labour has not been proved in those districts which are too far from railways to be much affected by the competition caused by them. Masters who pay their men fairly well and (so far as can be gathered) treat them well, say they have no difficulty in getting and keeping good labourers, and good labourers have no difficulty in getting work. Some employers of labour, both farmers and mechanics, have attempted to provide work for the "poor whites" (to whom I previously referred), who by the minute subdivision of farms among the children of the original owner, and by a sort of lazy pride, have come to a degraded state of poverty; but it has been found impossible to induce them to work and remain at work, and they have appeared nearly useless while they did work. Some parents of "poor whites," however, were anxious to apprentice them to a trade.

Payment of farm labourers is in most cases partly in kind, either of their food, or an allowance, *e.g.* of a hundred pounds of meal and a sheep and a half a month. The vicious custom (already alluded to) of paying them in the form of wine is worse than had previously been mentioned in evidence; in some cases it amounts to three bottles of wine a day. There is, however, this much to be said for the custom, that it provides them with as much liquor as they can need, and so renders canteens unnecessary in country districts; but, on the other hand, the licensing authorities may not see the matter in the same light, and allow canteens in addition. Many Dutch farmers advocate a free use of the lash as a punishment for breach of contract on the part of the coloured labourers (would they advocate it for breach of contract on the part of the farmers?), but the evidence shows more and more plainly that it is the too free supply of liquor that is ruining the coloured races, not merely as labourers but morally as well: yet they continue to supply it to their servants, and uphold the system which allows brandy to be carried on the Government Railways at a cheaper rate than corn!

It may be mentioned in this connection that, in the Orange Free State, it is illegal to sell liquor to a native without a written order from his master, and in places outside townships no houses are licensed for the sale of liquor. The administration of the law, however, is so lax that in country places certainly, and (I believe) generally speaking in towns also, a native has no difficulty in obtaining liquor. In the Colony the Kaffirs are crying out for prohibition, but the interests of the wine and brandy farmers are too powerful to be attacked.

With regard to "poor whites" much has been said and little done. Two ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church are endeavouring to raise the funds necessary to start a school to give them both mental and industrial education in Capetown. My forecast of a speedy response to any scheme seems to have been too sanguine.

V. T. KIRBY.

SOME ECONOMIC DOCTRINES OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS.—I propose in this note to give a short account of what St. Thomas Aquinas has to say on the subject of property, sales, and usury. The most important passages dealing with these points are contained in the third volume of the *Summa Theologica* (*secunda secundæ*¹), in questions 66, 77, and 78. There are also passages relating to these points in other parts of his works, and to some of these I will refer. While I condense as far as possible the passages I deal with, I give as much as I can in the words of St. Thomas.

Property.—Man has, by nature, dominion (*dominium*) over external things so far as regards their use.² This natural "dominium" does not include the possession of property by individuals.³ But by human consent, expressed in positive law (*secundum humanum conductum, quod pertinet ad jus positivum*), the power of procuring and distributing external things has been assigned to individuals for three reasons.⁴ (1) Every man is more anxious to seek to gain something which will belong to himself alone, than to endeavour to obtain something which he will share with many or all. (2) Human affairs proceed in a more orderly manner where individual property exists, for there would be great confusion if all were indiscriminately to seek to obtain the same things. (3) It tends to preserve peace among men, for each is content with what he possesses. Although individual property is not due to natural law, it is not in contradiction to it, but superadded by the device of human reason.⁵

While men are entitled to hold individual property so far as concerns the obtaining and distributing external things, they are bound, so far as their use is concerned, to treat them, not as things pertaining to themselves, but as common to all (*non debet homo habere res exteriores ut proprias, sed ut communes*).⁶ The reason of this is that, by the natural order of things appointed by divine providence, inferior things

¹ I will give references to it as Sum. 2.2.

² Sum. 2.2., q. 66. 1, 0, or, fully written out, "Secunda secundæ, quæstio 66, art. 1 corpus."

³ Ibid., q. 66. 2, 1, i.e. article 2 ad primum.

⁴ Ibid., q. 66. 2, 0.

⁵ Ibid., q. 66. 2, 1.

⁶ Ibid., q. 66. 0, 0.

are ordained to supply human needs.¹ Therefore what men have of superfluous is by natural law due for the sustenance of the poor.

This has a very communistic ring about it, but it must be noted that St. Thomas leaves the distribution of their property to the owners, who are entitled first to supply their own necessities, and these are not to be taken in any narrow sense. On the other hand, St. Thomas very strongly insists on the duty of helping the poor, and goes so far as to say, "where there is such evident and urgent necessity that it is manifest that help must be given from whatever is at hand, as, for instance, if a person is in danger and cannot otherwise be helped, then we may lawfully give assistance from the property of others, whether it be taken openly or by stealth."²

St. Thomas goes thus much farther than the ordinary Christian moralist, for he not merely asserts that we are not at liberty to deal with our property as we will, but says, in several passages, that in cases of extreme necessity "all things become common," and if the owner fails to do his duty or is not at hand, others may do it for him.

Sales.—There are two kinds of exchange³—

(1) The exchange of one article against another, or against money to supply the necessities of life. This appears to belong not properly to merchants, but rather to the heads of houses or of States who have to provide what is necessary for their family or state.

(2) The exchange of money for money, or of anything whatever for money, not on account of the necessities of life, but on account of gain.

The first kind of exchange is natural and necessary, and therefore laudable, while the second kind has, considered in itself, something of baseness, for it serves only the lust of gain which has no limit. But the desire of gain is not necessarily vicious, and "gain may be employed for some necessary or even honourable (*honestum*) purpose; and, if this is the case, to engage in business as a merchant is lawful, as when a man uses the moderate gain he earns by his merchandise for the support of his household," or the support of the poor, or the public good, and seeks gain, not as an end, but as the wages of his labour.

There is manifest here a considerable difference between the views of St. Thomas and Aristotle. It is no longer trade that is looked down on and despised, but merely the pursuit of riches as an end in itself which is condemned.

St. Thomas lays down a number of rules as to sales, especially on

¹ Sum. 2.2., q. 66. 7, 0.

² Ibid., 66. 7, 0. For similar passages, vide *Scriptum in Distinctiones*, Part iv., dis. 15, q. 2, 5.

³ Sum. 2.2., 77. 4, 0.

points concerning prices and the disclosure to buyers of defects in the things sold, but he does not wish to see them dealt with by human laws.¹ It suffices if law prohibits those actions which would destroy human society ; it cannot deal with all wrongful actions, for it is intended for all men, and not for the virtuous alone. It is enough, then, if the law forbids fraudulent dealing in buying or selling, unless there be some extreme excess in the price, as, for instance, if any one be deceived by more than half the price of the thing sold, in which case even the human law compels restitution.

The seller is bound to make restitution not only morally but legally if he sells one thing for another, or if the quantity is deficient, or if there is a defect in the quality ; and what applies to the seller holds good also of the buyer, who is bound to recompense the vendor who has, under a mistaken impression regarding any of the points noted above, sold anything for less than its value.²

Morally the vendor is bound to disclose any hidden defect which would affect the price of the thing sold,³ but he is not obliged to point out any obvious defect provided he makes a reasonable deduction from the price.⁴ The vendor is not bound to disclose to the buyer the probability of events occurring which are likely to affect the price.

In fixing the price of an article, the buyer may consider, not only the thing itself, but also the loss he incurs by the sale ; on the other hand, he has no right to charge a higher price because of the benefit which will accrue to the purchaser.⁵

The most notable points in the rules laid down by St. Thomas are, perhaps, those which provide that advantage must not be taken of the necessities of the buyer, and that the buyer is bound not to take advantage of mistakes on the part of the seller. St. Thomas also assumes that there is such a thing as a fair price.

Usury.—"To accept interest for money lent is unjust in itself, because that is sold which does not exist ;" for money belongs to that class of things of which the use is equivalent to the consumption, as wine, wheat, etc.⁶ There are other things, such as houses, which may be used without being consumed, and here therefore it is legitimate to retain the ownership of a house and yet let it out for a time to hire. Money was invented principally to facilitate exchanges, and therefore its principal use is when it is consumed by being passed from hand to hand in effecting exchanges. A man, therefore, according to St. Thomas, who sells money is not entitled to anything more than the return of an equal quantity ; for, unlike other things, it has no utility in

¹ Sum. 2.2., q. 67. 1, 1.² Ibid., q. 67. 2, 0.³ Ibid., q. 67. 3, 0.⁴ Ibid., q. 67. 3, 4.⁵ Ibid., q. 67. 1, 0.⁶ Ibid., q. 68. 1, 0.

itself, but only as a measure of the utility of other things.¹ Interest, therefore, in any shape, whether in money or in kind, is unlawful.²

Similarly, it is usury if the seller asks a higher price than would otherwise be just because he allows time for payment, or if the buyer asks for discount on account of payment before delivery; on the other hand, a seller may, without being guilty of usury, sell his articles at a lower price for the sake of speedy payment.

St. Thomas specifically raises the question whether one who lends money is not entitled to a reward, as he thereby is rendered unable to get any profit by using the money himself.³ He answers in the negative, on the ground that one has no right to sell that which does not exist, and what might in many ways be prevented from coming into existence. While the sale of the use of money intended as currency is unlawful, it is permissible to sell the use of the precious metals when made into vessels, or for purposes of ostentation, or to replace a pledge; for here the use of such articles is not equivalent to their consumption.⁴ A partner in a business, also, does not transfer the "dominium" of his money; and, as he shares in the risks, he may also lawfully share in the profits.⁵ That usury is permitted by law is due to the fact that, as noted above, laws do not deal with all faulty human actions.⁶

In conclusion, it may be noted that it is not a sin to borrow from a usurer, because he who receives the loan does not consent to the sin of usury, but makes use of it.⁷

R. W. CARLYLE.

¹ *Scriptum in Tertium Sententiarum Librum*, dis. 37, q. 1. 6, 0.

² *Sum.* 2.2, q. 68. 2, 0.

³ *Ibid.*, q. 68. 2, 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, q. 68. 4, 6.

⁵ *Ibid.*, q. 78. 2, 5.

⁶ *Ibid.*, q. 78. 1, 3.

⁷ *Ibid.*, q. 78. 4, 0.

LEGISLATION, PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES, AND OFFICIAL RETURNS.

THE *Railway Regulation Act*, 1893 (56 and 57 Vict., chap. 29, 4to, 2 pp., $\frac{1}{4}$ d.), adopts in substance the recommendations of the Select Committee on railway servants' hours of labour which reported last spring (*Economic Review*, July, 1892, pp. 411-13). It gives the Board of Trade power to order a railway company to submit "such a schedule of time for the duty of the servants, or any class of the servants of the company; as will, in the opinion of the Board, bring the actual hours of work within reasonable limits, regard being had to all the circumstances of the traffic, and to the nature of the work." If the company fails to submit a satisfactory schedule, or neglects to enforce the provisions of a schedule which has been submitted and approved, the Board may bring the case before the Railway and Canal Commission. The Commission will then have jurisdiction, and may impose a fine of £100 a day if the company fails to satisfy it. The machinery of the act can only be put in motion when "it is represented to the Board of Trade by or on behalf of the servants, or any class of the servants, of a railway company, that the hours of labour of those servants, or of that class, or, in any special case, of any particular servants engaged in working the traffic, on any part of the lines of the company, are excessive, or do not provide sufficient intervals of uninterrupted rest between the periods of duty, or sufficient relief in respect of Sunday duty;" and the Board must be satisfied that there is reasonable ground of complaint. The words just quoted from sub-section 1 of clause 1, seem plainly to indicate that the act applies only to servants engaged in working the traffic on the line; but in sub-section 7 it is thought necessary to expressly exclude from the scope of the act not only persons employed wholly in clerical work, many of whom, from the general manager downwards, are doubtless engaged in working the traffic, but also persons employed wholly in the company's workshops. As every railway company employs numbers of persons who are neither engaged in working the traffic on the line, nor in clerical work, nor in the workshops, this rather suggests that the act was

supposed to apply to all railway servants except the clerks and workshop people expressly excluded. It is not likely, however, that the act will ever be put in motion, if at all, except in the case of signalmen, enginemen, and guards.

The *Reformatory Schools Act*, 1893 (56 and 57 Vict., chap. 48, 4to, 2 pp., ½d.), makes it possible for judges and magistrates to send a boy or girl to a reformatory school without the preliminary ten days' imprisonment hitherto indispensable. Section 14 of the Act of 1866 is repealed, and the following is now the provision under which the schools will receive all future recruits : "Where a youthful offender, who in the opinion of the court before whom he is charged is less than sixteen years of age, is convicted, whether on indictment or by a court of summary jurisdiction, of an offence punishable with penal servitude or imprisonment, and either (a) appears to the court to be not less than twelve years of age ; or (b) is proved to have been previously convicted of an offence punishable with penal servitude or imprisonment, the court may, in addition to or in lieu of sentencing him according to law to any punishment, order that he be sent to a certified reformatory school, and there be detained for a period of not less than three, and not more than five years, so, however, that the period is such as will, in the opinion of the court, expire at or before the time at which the offender will attain the age of nineteen years."

The *General rules and regulations for the management of certified Reformatory Schools for the detention of juvenile offenders* (Command Paper 7119, fol., 8 pp., 1d.), and *General rules for the management and discipline of certified Industrial Schools for the detention of children* (Command Paper 7118, fol., 8 pp., 1d.) are "model rules to indicate what is necessary to managers who prepare a code of rules for their school, and submit it to the Secretary of State for his approval." The regulations for the two different classes of schools are very much alike, except that the religious instruction of the "Young Offenders" of the reformatory seems a far less delicate matter than that of the "children" of the industrial schools, and that the young offenders may in some cases be rather more severely punished for misconduct than the children. The corporal punishment of girls is not allowed in either class of school, and indeed the very mention of it is avoided by an elegant periphrasis—corporal punishment, it is laid down, may not be inflicted "upon any but boys."

The *Thirty-sixth Report* (1892) of the *Inspector of the Reformatory and Industrial Schools of Great Britain* (Command Paper 7084, 8vo, 476 pp., 1s. 11d., postage 4½d.) contains a pathetic appeal. The inspector says : "The schools of detention continue to be carried on

satisfactorily, and are doing the work of reformation quietly and unostentatiously—too quietly, I sometimes think, for if the work done could be brought more before the public, I cannot help thinking the schools would receive more support than they do at present. As it is, how many people know much about the schools and their work beyond the fact that such institutions exist, and are largely assisted by government? The blue-book for which I am writing gives a good deal of information on the subject; but its circulation is very limited, and the only way in which it reaches the general public is through the medium of a leading article occasionally in one or other of the morning papers," and, the inspector might have added, in the annual notice of his report in the *Economic Review* (see especially Jan., 1893, pp. 122, 123). "If," he continues, "after reading one of these articles, any one prepared to take an interest in the matter would visit one of our schools, I think he would gain much information which cannot be gained from a formal and necessarily short report from this office." The number of children in the schools at the end of 1892 was 29,351.

The bulk of Mr. W. A. Peterkin's *Report to the Board of Supervision on the system in Scotland of boarding pauper children in private dwellings* (Command Paper 7140, 8vo, 46 pp., 2½d., postage 1d.) consists of excerpts from the returns made by the Inspectors of the Poor, officers who perform the duties which fall on both the clerks to the guardians and the relieving officers in England. The total number of children dealt with in these reports is more than 23,000, of whom 4318 were chargeable in 1892. The supervision of the foster parents seems less thorough than in England; and officious inspectors of rural parishes sometimes endeavour to supply the want of it by meddling with the children placed in their parish by other parishes. It is rather surprising to find that this is to some extent sanctioned by the Board of Supervision, and that Mr. Peterkin rather sympathizes with it. On one occasion he himself took the local inspector with him when he went to see the sleeping accommodation of some boarded-out children, and then seems to have been a little surprised and hurt when he was afterwards told that he had given great offence. In spite of all defects in the organization, the children turn out well. The inspectors are almost all warmly in favour of the system; but one or two of them are enthusiasts for any kind of bringing up by the parish. The inspector of Dores has "observed that generally pauper children are more successful in after-life than those who were more comfortably brought up." The inspector of South Leith has a good word for the workhouse school, which gives "a training to be not

altogether regarded unworthily." During his inspectorship one boy brought up in the poor-house has become a considerable landed proprietor, and is member of a School Board, a Parochial Board, and a Town Council. "Another is carrying on a large cooperage business of his own. Another is master of one of our largest steamships; and another was recently on a visit from America, where, as a retired mercantile man, he is a member of Congress, having on his visit his own conveyance and the attendance of a negro servant in livery." Many of the inspectors say that it is better to board children with relatives than with strangers. Here the Scotch experience appears to be contrary to the English. Political economists will appreciate a quotation from a report made in 1880 by Mr. Skelton, the present chairman of the Board of Supervision, to the effect that "the boarding-out system was everywhere in use throughout Scotland; and it must now be admitted, by even sound economists, that in Scotland, at least, the system had worked well."

The progress of boarding out in England is dealt with by Miss Mason, in her usual lively and interesting style, in the *Twenty-second Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1892-3* (Command Paper 7180, 8vo, cxciii., 517 pp., 3s. 6d., postage 6d.), which, as always, contains a vast mass of information as to the working of the poor law and municipal economics generally.

One new feature has been introduced in response to the demands of Mr. Charles Booth and others. The number of individuals who have received relief at any time in the course of a particular year has been ascertained, and compared with the number in receipt of relief at one and the same time. As might naturally be expected, it appears that old people when once on the rates remain there longer than people in the working period of life, and that women paupers remain paupers longer than men. It appears also that the indoor paupers are a more changing body than the outdoor. The following tables give the figures obtained:—

I.—PERSONS IN RECEIPT OF RELIEF ON JANUARY 1, 1892.

	Indoor.	Outdoor.	Total.
Under 16	51,611	177,567	229,178
Men, 16 to 65 ..	41,269	29,686	70,955
Women, 16 to 65 ..	36,146	96,070	132,216
Men over 65	37,803	59,707	97,510
Women over 65 ..	25,549	145,338	170,887
Total ..	192,378	508,368	700,746

II.—PERSONS RELIEVED DURING THE YEAR ENDING LADY DAY, 1892.

	Indoor.	Outdoor.	Total.
Under 16	111,782	441,805	553,587
Men, 16 to 65 ..	134,561	141,826	276,387
Women, 16 to 65 ..	97,723	248,473	346,196
Men over 65	68,490	95,140	163,630
Women over 65 ..	45,654	192,620	238,274
Total ..	458,210	1,114,864	1,573,074

Vagrants and lunatics in asylums are excluded from both tables, but Table I. includes 21,469, and Table II. 211,082 persons who received medical relief only. The ratio which the number of persons relieved in the year bore to the number of paupers on January 1st varied very widely in different unions, and is said to have been highest in great towns and smallest in rural districts.

The *Report and Proceedings of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the Marking of Foreign Meat, with the Minutes of Evidence* (House of Commons Paper, 1893, No. 214, fol., xxxix., 220 pp., 3s. 1½d., postage 4½d.) contains a good deal of information interesting to all consumers of meat. Of the total meat supply in Great Britain and Ireland during 1892, one-third is estimated to have come from abroad, 178,000 tons alive, and 525,000 tons dead. In spite of the large imports and the "ruined condition" of agriculture, the home produce has increased from 1,330,000 tons in 1877, to 1,419,000 in 1892. The ordinary consumer cannot distinguish foreign meat from English even when the foreign has been frozen hard. Southport, a town of 41,500 inhabitants, with 54 butchers, is said on one occasion to have slaughtered only three English animals in a week.¹ One butcher states that he has long satisfied the requirements of certain customers who desire New Zealand mutton supplied in a thawed state, so that their servants shall not know what they are eating. The *suppressio veri*, the *suggestio falsi*, and the unmitigated lie are very common in the retail trade. Not only is foreign meat sold as English, but the inferior kinds of foreign meat are sometimes sold as the superior, e.g. River Plate mutton is put up for sale as "Prime Canterbury." The Committee discuss very calmly the question whether a system of marking

¹ The report says "it was stated that but three English animals were killed during the week," but the evidence (at question 382) was to the effect that there were only three English animals killed during one particular week in 1892. The statement in the report has been denied by the Southport medical officer.

imported meat should be enforced, so as to put a stop to these practices, and do not appear to be much biassed by any strong prejudices in favour of honesty in the abstract. The farmers, especially those of Lancashire, believe that if all foreign meat was marked, the price of home-grown meat would rise. The colonial and foreign importers, on the other hand, believe in the excellency of their wares sufficiently not to be afraid that they would fall. The butchers examined do not much object to the principle, and only require that they shall not be saddled with the cost ; but, of course, it must be remembered that the dishonest butcher is not likely to offer himself for examination before a committee. The Committee themselves incline to the view of the colonial and foreign meat importers. "It was very generally asserted before the Committee that the average excellence of imported meat was higher than that of home-grown meat," and they accordingly think and fear that if the system of misrepresentation were done away with, a large portion of the home-grown meat might fall below the best of the imported meat in price. "The Committee think that considerations such as these ought not to be lost sight of by those who are advocating this principle in the interests of the producers of meat in these islands." They are not prepared to go further than the recommendation that it should be "made obligatory on every butcher dealing in imported meat to register himself as such dealer," and to proclaim the fact upon his shop front. Even here an exception is to be made in favour of sweetbreads and veal, as almost every butcher in the country procures these from abroad at certain seasons of the year.

The Committee were appointed to consider the question of marking all kinds of imported agricultural produce, but deal only with meat in the present report. They hope to be reappointed next session to finish their labours.

The Report on Agencies and Methods for dealing with the Unemployed (Command Paper 7182, 8vo, 438 pp., 1s. 9d., postage 4½d.; Map of Westphalia, published separately, 2d.) is one of the first fruits of the reorganization of the Labour Department of the Board of Trade. In the first or introductory part of the book an attempt is made to classify the different meanings in which the term "unemployed" is ordinarily used, the main causes to which want of employment may be due, and the various agencies which have been created to deal with the matter. Parts II. and III. contain a description of the particular permanent and temporary agencies which have been at work in the United Kingdom during the past year. Part IV. gives some account of what is being done at present in foreign countries and New Zealand. Part V. deals with three

•

“Historical Examples,” namely, parish employment under the old Poor Law, the *ateliers nationaux* of 1848, and the Cotton Famine relief works. Part VI. consists of the concluding summary, and is followed by appendices giving a list and particulars of out-of-work benefits provided by trade unions, and a bibliography of labour colonies. If the book was bound in flashy boards and published at 7s. 6d. instead of 1s. 9d., it would be received as a most important contribution to political economy, and have a quite considerable sale. It is a most excellent piece of work in every way, and any one who begins or continues to direct a charitable or philanthropic agency without having read it will incur a very heavy responsibility. The main conclusions are that more complete co-operation among the existing agencies in each district is required rather than the establishment of new institutions, and that, if we may be allowed to borrow phrases from commercial economics, no attempts which merely aim at getting rid of the *stock* of unemployed without stopping the *supply* can be of any permanent utility. “The fact is, that the central difficulty to be met is not so much the existence of an unemployed class as the economic deterioration of the casually and insufficiently employed; and this is an evil which must in the main be met, if met at all, by measures of prevention rather than cure. Any proposal which sets out with the idea that the evils resulting from want of employment are capable of immediate remedy on a large scale should for this reason be regarded with the greatest caution. The result, then, of this inquiry is not to pronounce the problem insoluble, but to suggest that any hopeful solution is less a question of remedying results than of removing causes. Here we open up questions lying outside the scope of this report. So far as inefficiency is due to imperfect knowledge of a trade, we touch the question of training; so far as it is a matter of personal or moral deterioration, questions of sanitation and the general physical surroundings and conditions of labour are involved; so far as it is a matter of excessive trade oscillations, we verge on the wide and difficult question of the extent, if any, to which the violence of these fluctuations is due to preventible causes. Some of these subjects will form the subject of future reports.” This is good news, if the future reports maintain the standard of the one now before us.

Meantime, the Royal Commission on Labour, which was appointed on April 21, 1891, “to inquire into the questions affecting the relations between employer and employed; the combinations of employers and of employed; and the conditions of labour, *which have been raised during the recent trade disputes in the United Kingdom*,” continues to issue volumes dealing with questions affecting the conditions of

labour in general. The list from the middle of August to the middle of November comprises 3181 pages :—

Minutes of Evidence taken before the Commission sitting as a whole (Command Paper 7063—i., fol., 621 pp., 4s. 11d., postage 7½d.).

Minutes of Evidence Group C (textile, clothing, chemical, building, and miscellaneous trades) vol. iii. (C. 6894—ix., fol., 765 pp., 6s. 2d., postage 9d.).

Digest of Evidence Group C, vol. iii. (C. 6894—xii., fol., 288 pp., 2s. 3d., postage 4½d.).

Indexes—vol. i. : Index to the Evidence taken before Groups A, B, and C: Subjects (C. 7063—iv., fol., 128 pp., 1s. 3d., postage 4d.).

Indexes—vol. ii. : Index to the Evidence taken before Groups A, B, and C: Trades, part i., Group A (C. 7063—v., fol., 64 pp., 6d., postage 2d.).

Foreign Reports, vol. iii., Holland (C. 7063—vi., fol., 37 pp., 3½d., postage 1d.).

Foreign Reports, vol. iv., Belgium (C. 7063—viii., fol., 64 pp., 6d., postage 2d.).

The Employment of Women : Reports by Misses Eliza Orme, C. E. Collet, M. E. Abraham, and M. H. Irwin, on the conditions of work in various industries in the United Kingdom (C. 6894—xxiii., fol., 352 pp., 2s. 10d., postage 6d.).

The Agricultural Labourer—

Vol. i., England : part ii., Reports by Mr. Cecil M. Chapman on districts in Berks, Bucks, Cambridge, Cornwall, Devon, Herts, Oxford, and Salop (C. 6894—ii., fol., 162 pp., 1s. 4d., postage 4½d.).

Vol. ii., Wales : Reports by Mr. D. Lleuffer Thomas and Mr. C. M. Chapman (C. 6894—xiv., fol., 201 pp., 1s. 8d., postage 4½d.).

Vol. iii., Scotland : part i., Reports by Mr. H. Rutherford and the late Mr. G. R. Gillespie (C. 6894—xv., fol., 164 pp., 1s. 4d., postage 4d.).

Vol. iv., Ireland : part i., Reports by Mr. R. McCrea (C. 6894—xviii., fol., 129 pp., 1s. 1d., postage 3d.). *Part ii. : Reports by Mr. W. P. O'Brien* (C. 6894—xix., fol., 131 pp., 1s. 4d., postage 3d.). *Part iii. : Reports by Mr. R. C. Richards* (C. 6894—xx., fol., 75 pp., 7½d., postage 3d.).

The Women's Employment report contains an unnecessary amount of detail which should have been summarized instead of being published at length. The assistant commissioners have, however, managed to collect a good deal of important information which men would never have obtained. One of the titbits of the report is the remark of the manageress of a restaurant who ridiculed the idea of any of her staff

being flattered or amused by the idle talk of customers. "If they only knew it," she said, "we regard them no more than a set of bottles."

Mr. Chapman, in the Part which completes the volume on the agricultural labourer in England, deals with the unions of Thame, Wantage, North Witchford, Crediton, Truro, Atcham, and Buntingford. He does not take quite so cheerful a view of the situation as some of his colleagues. This is rather curious, considering that, unlike several of them, he does not find that just at the present time the fluctuation of wages is downward. "There has," he says, "been a general falling off since the prosperous days of 1874 to 1878; but there has been, during the last four or five years, a rise of one shilling a week in most places, as compared with the prices which ruled between 1882 and 1888. The deficiency in the supply of labour is likely to cause this upward tendency of wages to be maintained in spite of the depression, but many farmers doubt this." The discontent in Thame, and the bad water in the Wantage union, situated at the foot of the chalk downs, are somewhat remarkable. Agriculturists are said to have discovered that a farmer must either own capital or perform labour if he is to be successful. Mr. Chapman does not point out that the despised race of economists have long asserted that land, labour and capital are the only sources of wealth.

In the second or Welsh volume, the districts reported on are the unions of Bridgend and Cowbridge, Narberth, Llanfyllin, Dolgelley, Ruthin, Anglesey, Pwllheli, by Mr. Thomas, and Builth by Mr. Chapman. The condition of the Welsh labourer appears to be about equal to the English average. The South Wales labourer "is probably in a better position than ever before; the North Wales labourer was perhaps a little more flourishing about 1879." Mr. Chapman mentions a fact which, if it is typical, brings the improvement before the mind's eye more clearly than a volume of statistics. A certain general labourer, now aged seventy-four, has had fifteen shillings a week for the last twenty years; for seven years before that, when still in the vigour of middle age, he had twelve shillings a week; still earlier, when in lusty youth and the prime of life, he had but nine shillings. The chief needs of the labourers, Mr. Thomas believes, are agricultural instruction, means of recreation, and a more civilized method of housing the unmarried farm servants, who are boarded by their employer and, as a rule, are lodged in outhouses along with the horses and cows.

Mr. Rutherford's Scotch report does not suggest much difference between the purely economic position of the English and Scotch labourers. Socially, however, the stronger position of the Scotch is well shown by the fact that the labourers had no objection to the

presence of farmers at their own meetings with the commissioner. Differences of national character come out in a labourer's assertion that the reason why the farmers paid the young men sums on account, instead of waiting till the end of the term, was that they might be spared the anguish of parting with large amounts at one time. The self-made farmers, who were once labourers, are not good employers: "they seem to be aye wanting mair and mair."

In the Irish volume we find ourselves in quite a different world. The best of the Irish districts are only about on a level with the very worst of the English, Welsh, and Scotch. Mr. McCrea complacently says, "In estimating the condition of the Irish labourer, an English standard cannot be adopted. The Irishman does not work so hard, nor do his wants approach those of the Englishman. Even where best employed, he is much more abstemious, both in food and drink, living on potatoes, flour-bread, and tea, oatmeal porridge and milk, with a small quantity of bacon, eggs, butter, and salt fish, and butcher's meat only as an occasional luxury." This is a very eighteenth-century view of the matter. Mr. McCrea seems to forget that "it is not because one man keeps a coach while his neighbour walks afoot that the one is rich and the other poor." Mr. Richards, on the other hand, being unacquainted with Ireland, could not fail to compare the Irish with the English standard. The "squalor and wretchedness" which he found in the Loughrea Union was in such contrast with the state of the worst districts he had examined in England, that he was unable to sleep in his bed. Mr. O'Brien's report contains an interesting map, showing how far the guardians have availed themselves of the powers of the Labourers' Acts. In Munster they have provided 7242 cottages under the Acts, in Leinster 4464, in Connaught 87, and in Ulster 78. The provision is almost entirely confined to the south-eastern half of the island, as the few cottages in Ulster and Connaught are nearly all in unions bordering on the other provinces. In Leinster and Munster only four unions are without these "Union cottages," which form a peculiar example of municipal socialism in a country with a rapidly declining population.

In spite of the well-known fact, referred to more than once in these reports, that large numbers of Irish people go to America as soon as they can scrape together enough money to pay their passage, it has been widely believed that the United States refuse to receive immigrants unable to show that they are in possession of a modest competence. This belief should be finally dispelled by Messrs. Schloss and Burnett's *Reports to the Board of Trade on Alien Immigration into the United States* (C. 7113, 8vo, 383 pp., 1s. 7d., postage

4½d.). Mr. Schloss with his own eyes has seen "the sifting process" at the several ports, and has observed that "one man with only 5s. in the world, two persons with only 2s. each, one man with only 10d., two persons (the one a man, the other an unmarried woman) with no money whatever in their possession, all these were allowed to land." An alien is not excluded because he is "destitute," unless his destitution indicates that he is "likely to become a public charge." The laws restricting European immigration are a hotch-potch in which it is difficult to detect any general principle. "Persons suffering from a loathsome or a dangerous contagious disease, persons who have been convicted of a felony or other infamous crime or misdemeanour involving moral turpitude," and "polygamists" are obviously excluded because they are likely to corrupt the health or the morals of the existing citizens and inhabitants of the country. "Idiots, insane persons, paupers, or persons likely to become a public charge," and "any person whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another, or who is assisted by others to come," are excluded because they are likely to involve the country in expense. Persons who come "under contract or agreement, parol or special, express or implied," made before their landing, "to perform labour or service of any kind in the United States," are excluded because it is supposed that their importation tends to reduce wages. The exceptions to these general rules are numerous. Persons whose passage is paid for by others are admitted if it can be "affirmatively and satisfactorily shown on special inquiry" that they do not belong to the diseased, the criminal, the probable pauper, or the contract labourer class. Contract labourers may be introduced "to perform labour in the United States in or upon any new industry not at present established in the United States, provided that skilled labour for that purpose cannot be otherwise obtained." They may also be introduced to perform various kinds of work which trade-unionism has not taken under its ægis: not only "professional actors, artists, lecturers, or singers," and "ministers of any religious denomination," "persons belonging to any recognized profession," and "professors for colleges and seminaries," but also "persons employed strictly as personal or domestic servants" may be imported under contract. Very few intending immigrants are actually rejected at the ports; but the general law prevents foreign governments and philanthropic societies from making the United States a "dumping ground" for criminals and paupers. The contract labour law prevents wholesale importations of labourers, although a certain want of candour while under examination enables large numbers of immigrants to evade it. This is especially the case

with Canadians, and it is complained that "they teach the contract labour law in the Nova Scotia schools." The law is administered in a kindly and occasionally a lofty spirit, which contrasts favourably with the petty jealousies in which parts of it had their origin. An immigrant has been heard to remark to a subordinate immigration officer, "If every one is going to be as kind to me as you are, I shall have pleasant times in America." A woman who arrives on the very eve of her confinement will not be sent back immediately, though "likely to become a public charge;" and when her child is born she will not be sent back without it, because she is its natural and necessary guardian: to send the child with her is, of course, out of the question, for he has been born on American soil and is a citizen of the United States. So both remain, in defiance of the letter of the law.

While Mr. Schloss was inquiring into the nature and administration of the United States laws respecting immigration, Mr. Burnett was following the instructions of the Board of Trade to examine "the nature and economic effects of that portion of the immigration which is of the character of the recent immigration of destitute foreigners from the eastern parts of Europe into England." His report, however, is a treatise on the whole question of immigration into the United States. The comparative importance of this immigration in the last four decades may be shown by the following statistics. In 1850 the foreign-born population was 96 per thousand of the whole; in 1860 it had risen to 131, and in 1870 to 144; then it fell to 133 in 1880, but rose again to 147 in 1890. The whole population nearly tripled itself in the forty years, and the foreign element more than quadrupled itself. Of the total of 9,249,547 persons of foreign birth England and Wales have contributed 1,009,171, Scotland 242,231, Ireland 1,871,509, Canada and Newfoundland 980,938, making a total from the British Empire of 4,103,749. Germany comes next with 2,784,894, and then, after a long interval, Sweden and Norway with 800,706, Austria-Hungary with 303,812, Russia (not including Poland) with 182,644, Italy with 182,580, and Poland with 147,440. Nearly all the Russians and many of the Poles are Jews. In the last decade the Germans have increased 818,152, the British, Irish, and Canadians 614,523, the Swedes and Norwegians 424,640, the Austro-Hungarians 168,262, the Russians 146,922, the Italians 138,350, and the Poles 98,883. The Irish immigration was so enormous in the middle of the century that it is now scarcely more than sufficient to maintain the Irish-born population. Between 1870 and 1880 the Irish-born diminished by 1256, and between 1880 and 1890 they only increased by 16,938.

Mr. Burnett discusses the character of the immigration from each of the various countries in considerable detail. Though every one in the United States except the Indians is either an immigrant or the descendant of people who have immigrated since the time of Columbus, an extraordinary jealousy of immigration prevails in certain quarters on account of its supposed tendency to reduce wages. Citizens of the great republic actually complain "that in certain frontier towns people from Canada cross over daily and work their day's work in the United States while residing in Canada." Mr. Burnett treats this complaint with a courtesy to which it seems scarcely entitled when he solemnly points out that, after all, many people living in the United States go to their daily work in Canada. If Detroit is injured by the fact that some hundred of Canadians from Windsor, on the opposite bank of the river, work there, how disastrous to Liverpool must be the daily invasion of thousands of men from Birkenhead! The only real and important objection to the immigrants is founded on the tendency of some of them, especially the Italian and Russian Jews, to huddle together in particular quarters of the great towns, and there to over-crowd particular branches of industry, and live in the most uncivilized and insanitary conditions. To check this tendency would not appear to be impossible, and in New York and other places the task is being attempted.

From the *Census of England and Wales*, 1891, vol. iii., *Ages, condition as to marriage, occupations, birthplaces, and infirmities* (Command Paper 7058—fol. lxiv., 564 pp., 5s., postage 7½d.), it appears that the number of aliens enumerated in this country was 198,113, a little under seven per thousand of the whole population. Small as this proportion is, it is considerably greater than that which prevailed in 1881. Then there were 117,999 aliens, or between four and five per thousand of the whole population. Comparing the detailed tables of 1891 with those of the 1881 census, we find that the Russians have increased from 3789 to 23,626, the Russian Poles from 10,679 to 21,448, the Germans from 37,301 to 50,599, the French from 14,596 to 20,797, and aliens from all the other European countries from 32,252 to 52,344. The United States contingent has increased from 17,767 to 19,740, and other American foreigners have made a surprising leap upwards from 729 to 6486, for which the civil troubles in South America are doubtless responsible. The Africans (including Egyptians) have increased from 258 to 1052, the Chinese from 202 to 767, and other Asiatics from 258 to 1037. Of all the countries which are separately specified, not one shows a decrease. Conversely, every county in England and Wales except Lincolnshire and Rutland has

participated in the increase. The London foreigners, many will be surprised to learn, have increased less rapidly than those in the rest of the country. There does not appear to be any large increase in the suburbs, and those within the county of London have increased from 60,252 to 95,053, 57 per cent., while those in the rest of the country have increased from 57,747 to 103,060, 78 per cent. In 1881 the county of London contained more than 51½ per cent. of all the foreigners : in 1891 it contained scarcely 48 per cent. Of the Poles and Russians, however, it had slightly increased proportions, the London Poles being 68 per cent. against 63 per cent. in 1881, and the London Russians 51 per cent. against 47 per cent. in 1881. Besides the Russians and Russian Poles the county of London had also more than 50 per cent. of the Dutch (67 p.c.), Hungarians (63 p.c.), Austrians (61 p.c.), Belgians (54 p.c.), Italians (52 p.c.), Chinese (52 p.c.), and Germans (51 p.c.). Of citizens of the United States it had only 25 per cent. The 95,053 aliens in the county of London are, of course, very unequally distributed. There were in 1891 only 12,429 south of the Thames, while there were 17,961 in Whitechapel alone. Whitechapel and the two adjoining districts of St. George and Mile End Old Town had a total of 31,091 foreigners in 1891, as compared with 15,290 in 1881. The Russians here increased from 1135 to 9579, and the Poles from 5617 to 12,372 : the other foreigners taken together slightly diminished in number. Outside London the only considerable colonies of Russians and Poles are in Manchester, where there were 5486 in the city of Manchester and borough of Salford, and Leeds, where there were 4546. The total number of foreigners in Manchester and Salford was 10,163, in Liverpool and Birkenhead 8065 (including of course a large proportion of sailors), and in Leeds 5927. In no other town were there as many as three thousand.

If the censuses are to be believed, the number of British subjects born abroad who were in England in 1891 was much smaller than the number who were in England in 1881, and a little less than the number who were in England in 1871. In 1861 the number was put at 17,742, in 1871 at 38,807, in 1881 at 56,373, and in 1891 at only 34,895. It is difficult to imagine that the real number can have varied in this way, and probably some explanation will be forthcoming. No information is given as to the proportions in which the total is divided between naturalized aliens and children of British parents.

The substitution of steam for sailing ships has reduced the number of "persons born at sea," from 4628 in 1881 to 4305 in 1891.

British Colonies and Dependencies contributed 111,627 to the population against 94,399 in 1881. No information whatever is vouchsafed

as to the component parts of this mass. "Islands in the British Seas" (Man and the Channel Islands) contributed 30,370 persons against 29,316 in 1881.

The Scots in England numbered 282,271. In 1881 they were 253,528, and in 1871, 213,254.

The Irish show an enormous diminution. In 1841 they were 289,404. The potato famine raised the number to 519,959 in 1851, and the highest point was reached in 1861, when the number was 601,634. Thence it fell to 566,540 in 1871 and 562,374 in 1881. In the last decade it has dropped right down to 458,315.

Of the 27,882,629 natives of England and Wales who were enumerated, a little more than two-thirds were found in the county of their birth. In eighteen counties the population was greater, and in the other thirty-five it was smaller than the number of natives of those counties enumerated in the whole of England and Wales. The county of London owed 625,642 of its population to the excess of non-native residents over non-resident natives, Lancashire 624,581, Middlesex 247,475, Glamorgan 205,692, York 195,113, Durham 158,721, Surrey 142,983, Essex 141,604, Hampshire 54,441, and Cheshire, Sussex, Monmouth, Northumberland, Kent, Nottingham, Derby, Warwick, and Carnarvon smaller amounts. The largest contribution to the population of other counties was made by Norfolk, the natives of which numbered 579,351, while the population was only 454,516; but in proportion to its size Rutland, with 28,755 natives and only 20,659 inhabitants, was the largest contributor.

When we have satisfied ourselves as to where the inhabitants of England were born, the next question to consider is when they were born. Mr. Booth's estimate that there were 1,323,000 men and women over 65 was not far wrong, the actual number being 1,372,602. In the "buffer state," between the middle aged under 60 and the old over 65, there were 772,879; in the working period of life, from 15 to 60, there were 16,684,809; in childhood under 15 there were 10,172,235. Comparing the figures for 1891 with those given in the 1881 census, we find that the proportion of people over 60 has remained stationary at 73 per thousand, the proportion between 15 and 60 has risen from 561 per thousand to 575, and the proportion under 15 has fallen from 364 per thousand to 351. The reduction in the proportion of children does not extend to those between 10 and 15. These were the survivors of 4,430,106 persons born in 1876-80, and consequently were very much more numerous than the children between 10 and 15 in 1881, who were the survivors of only 3,875,245 persons born in 1866-70. But the children between 5 and 10 were

the survivors of 4,464,398 persons born in 1881-85, and consequently were not so very much more numerous than the children of the same age in 1881, who were the survivors of 4,158,676 persons born in 1871-75; and the children under 5 were the survivors of 4,425,840 persons born in 1886-90, and consequently exceeded by a very trifling amount their predecessors of 1881, who were the survivors of 4,430,106 persons born in 1876-80. If there had been no diminution of infantile mortality, the children under 5 in 1891 would obviously have been positively fewer than the children under 5 in 1881. In the following table the actual numbers are given :—

	Persons born.	Survivors, 1871.	Survivors, 1881.	Survivors, 1891.
1861-65	3,624,851	2,706,526	2,547,232	2,350,259
1866-70	3,875,245	3,071,276	2,800,331	2,646,412
1871-75	4,185,676		3,147,396	2,950,865
1876-80	4,430,106		3,520,864	3,223,567
1881-85	4,464,398			3,395,178
1886-90	4,425,840			3,553,490

These figures should comfort the Chancellor of the Exchequer and depress the purveyors of school books, as they show that there can be no considerable increase in the number of school children for some years.

Considering the frequency of the complaint that the country districts are being denuded of people in the prime of life, it is not a little surprising to find that the people between 25 and 40 living in rural sanitary districts in 1891, were more numerous than the people of that age living in rural sanitary districts in 1881, while the children, youths, and people over 40 suffered a heavy decline. The children under 5 were 125,140 fewer, those between 5 and 10 were 70,525 fewer, and those between 10 and 15 were 20,027 fewer; the decline between 15 and 25 was 16,486; people between 25 and 40 increased 31,803 and people over 40 diminished 29,879. If the rural sanitary districts had had their full share of the population between 20 and 35 they would have had 223,000 more people between those ages than they actually had, but the loss, which of course is caused by migration to the urban districts, was less than in 1881, when it amounted to about 246,000. It must of course be remembered that in the course of the decade many urban sanitary districts have been extended and others created, so that an area which contained about 400,000 inhabitants in 1881, has been taken away from the rural sanitary districts. If the statistics for the same area were given in 1891 as in 1881, the changes in age-distribution might therefore appear somewhat different.

The stationary condition of the births is accounted for in part by the slightly more celibate character of the population and the diminution of youthful wives. The unmarried women between 20 and 45 increased from 1,618,924 to 2,009,489 in the decade, while the married women between those ages only increased from 2,910,770 to 3,214,672. Wives under 20 actually decreased from 32,416 to 28,860, and wives between 20 and 25 only increased from 402,019 to 414,354.

Comment on the tables of Occupations must be reserved till the General Report is before us, as certain changes in classification and other alterations have been made which require explanation.

EDWIN CANNAN.

REVIEWS.

DICTIONARY OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. Edited by R. H. INGLIS PALGRAVE, F.R.S. Parts IV. and V. [Each 128 pp. 8vo. Each 3s. 6d. net. Macmillan. London, 1893.]

Since my last notice, the fourth and fifth parts of Mr. Inglis Palgrave's Dictionary have appeared. These parts deal with a number of the most important terms in Political Economy—"Consumption," "Co-operation," "Corporation," "Cost of Production," "Credit," "Crises," "Debts," "Demand," "Discount," "Distribution;" and nearly every one of them is split up into three or four subdivisions, each treating of a different aspect of the subject, and each from the pen of a different writer. Thus, under the heading "Co-operation," we find successively "Co-operative Association," "Co-operative Farming," "Co-operative Workshops," "Partial Co-operation" (*i.e.* Profit-Sharing), and lastly, "Social Aspects of Co-operation." This method, although it might be called fragmentary, is better than that followed in the French Dictionary, in which every subject is dealt with *ex professo* in a single lengthy article. Although it is exposed to the danger of sundry repetitions, perhaps even of some slight contradictions, yet it concisely exhibits the subject under all its aspects. Thus, in the article upon "Co-operative Associations," the author, Mr. Wynnard Hooper, tells us that in respect to co-operative societies for agriculture and banking, the continental countries have made further progress than has England. But if we turn to the term "Co-operative Farming," we do not receive the impression that England is in a more backward state than France or any other country. In fact, we find a list of co-operative farms, whose extent varies from eleven to three hundred and seventy acres, one of which, the Scottish Farming Society, is about to undertake three additional farms. We have nothing in France which can compare with this. Not one, out of our seven to eight hundred agricultural syndicates, is devoted to agriculture in the true sense: there are societies for the purchase of seed, manure, and agricultural instruments, but there are no farms.

Under the word "Debt," we notice a full table giving the total of

the public debts of each of the colonies belonging to the British empire and for all the European countries. We are thus enabled to see what is the burden placed on each country in capital and in interest, and the proportion relatively to each head of the population. Within the British empire this proportion varies from 4s. 10d. in the Isle of Tobago, to £71 15s. in Queensland! For the United Kingdom the proportion is but £18 2s. : in European countries, the proportion varies—from the 10s. in Montenegro (happy land!), £2 in Sweden, to the 33 guineas in France. In regard to Russia, the table contains a misprint, which, however, is easily rectified: the proportion is £4 18s. per head, and not £14 18s.; but in order to obtain an exact computation, it must be noted that the Russian debt certainly exceeds £552,179,122: it amounts at the least to seven hundred millions. In America the proportion varies from 12s. for Bolivia to £37 10s. 3d. for the Argentine Republic. Further, these tables show what proportion of the total debt of each country is represented by reproductive works; but here our data are so uncertain and hard to determine that we are unable to attach much value to the estimates given. It would seem, however, that the Australians are much less indebted than we should otherwise have believed. Against the £7,589,078, representing the sum-total of their debt, we notice in the column headed "Covered by Reproductive Works" (probably State-owned), receipts amounting to £3,867,267. The debt is therefore diminished by one-half.

In regard to the phrase "Cost of Production," it may be remarked that the author (the authorship is with difficulty discovered on reference to a small table printed in hieroglyphic type on the cover), faithful to the tradition of English economists, includes profits among the cost of production. This has always appeared to French economists somewhat strange.

But the treatment in Mr. Palgrave's Dictionary of great subjects, which may always be found in general treatises on Political Economy, is hardly more important than the discussion of the smaller words, seldom discussed elsewhere. To each of these a brief but substantial account is devoted, and it is here that we are most struck with the richness of the work and the admirable patience of the author. We might well have wondered how such terms as "Conjunctur," "Consumer's Rent," "Coulisse," "Council Bills," "Crossed Cheques," "Damnum Emergens," "Decimal System," "Deniers," "Dollars," etc., could be treated within the space of four lines in such a way as to lose none of their significance. In regard to "Deniers," Mr. Longhurst points out the instances in which this old word is still employed in France: *denier d'Anjou*, *denier de St. Pierre*, *denier de la veuve*,

etc. ; the writer omits nothing. Respecting "Conventional Tariff," however, the editor ought to have said that in France, as well, I believe, as in other European countries, this expression designates exclusively the tariff as fixed by commercial treaties, in opposition to the general tariff, or that which is fixed by the law ; but this is a slight omission. I may also be allowed to call attention to an unmistakably inaccurate assertion made in the article on "Small Culture." It is not true to say that in France "the real owners of the soil are local money-lenders." So far from this being the case, there is no country in which usury is less practised than in France, where mortgage debts do not exceed more than ten per cent. of the total value of the soil.

The biographical portion of the Dictionary should surely cover with confusion all who, like myself, will be bound to confess that they are acquainted with scarcely a moiety of the names indicated. The work of my two compatriots, De la Jonchère and De la Mare, has already caused us to open our eyes. Yet Mr. Ingram did not forget, as the two French Dictionaries have done, the name of Cournot, to whom Professor Edgeworth (we could not have a better critic) has devoted four columns. But, on the other hand, the fifteen lines devoted to Condillac are very inadequate and indeed rather inexact. It cannot be said of Condillac that "he supports the doctrines of the physiocrats, except in regard to industry," since he not only was a dissident, but vigorously assailed the school on several important points—notably on their theory of exchange and of value, which he was the first to state in the psychological form so much in vogue at the present day.

Perhaps I may be allowed to suggest that these biographical notices are rather too numerous, and that some of them might without inconvenience have been omitted, or, at least, reduced. For instance, Daniel Defoe occupies two columns, although his single important contribution to Political Economy is Robinson Crusoe's apostrophe to the sack of gold which he found among the wreckage cast up by the sea : "O Drug ! What art thou good for ?" On such a reckoning, there would be no literary man or novelist without a right to a place in the Dictionary !

CH. GIDE.

AGRICULTURAL INSURANCE IN ORGANIC CONNECTION WITH SAVINGS-BANKS, LAND-CREDIT, AND THE COMMUTATION OF DEBTS. By P. MAYET, Doctor of Political Sciences, Tübingen ; Royal Prussian Professor. Translated from the German by the REV. ARTHUR LLOYD, M.A.,

Head-master of Trinity College School, Port Hope, Canada ; formerly Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge. [xix., 388, xxviii. pp., with 9 folding tables. 8vo. 10s. 6d. Sonnenschein. London, 1893.]

Originally written in German and printed in Tokio by Japanese compositors, this work has now, according to the author, "put on an English dress." The dress is a very unbecoming and tattered garment. The absence of head-lines, and the superfluity and chaos of divisions and subdivisions, give the pages a thoroughly un-English appearance. Examining them more closely we find them full of misprints—"principle groups," p. 80 ; "protectiv forests," p. 88 ; "loose house and farm," p. 116 ; "examlpe," p. 161 ; "consequenly," p. 172 ; "permissable," p. 177 ; "means will de found," p. 179 ; "*Japan Weckly Mail*," p. 182 ; "colonists property," p. 200 ; "states'," for "state's," p. 220 ; "genexally," p. 239 ; "govemment," p. 259 ; "unsatisfastory," p. 269 ; "phylboxera," p. 356 ; "extremily obnoxious," p. 358 ; "nesessary," p. i. ; "groupes," p. ii. On p. 177 the word "estimates" is divided between two lines thus—estima-tes. The following words and phrases strike me as unfamiliar—"endangerment," p. 18 ; "devaluation of loss," p. 72 ; "subhastations," p. 163 ; "stabilising," p. 221 ; "the Breadtariffs and the Weightbakery," p. 259 ; "suppositionally," p. 343 ; "obnoxiously," p. 358 ; "devastatingly," p. 359 ; "impermissibility," p. vii. In the very first sentence of the preface, "the latter" suddenly makes its appearance where there is no former, and a plural subject takes a singular verb : "The following work on *Agricultural Insurance*, and such complements of the latter as seem to be requisite in order to improve the condition of the Japanese agriculturist, was originally composed in the spring of 1886." The author is made to claim enough insight "as to prevent" him "from making any untenable proposals," p. x. A solution can be "done," p. 6. "Before the war," we are told, "the losses through fire amounted annually to \$22,000,000, but the in 1865 to \$60,000,000 and in the following year to \$100,000,000," p. 45. The author has to pass "over" to another subject, p. 73. He adds "a casting up of totals, and a calculation of average increase percents giving it a tabular arrangement," p. 182. Different things are reckoned "to" different groups, pp. 81 and 82. "The Arbitration settlements moved at the General Commission will as a rule be worked out by special commissioners on the place of dispute," p. 120. Improvements, like solutions, are "done," p. 149. Certain enterprises are equally serviceable to future generations "as" to the present inhabitants, p. 178. Government receives "kind payments,"

p. 239. A land tax is "respite," p. 269. The translator's idea of how to deal with a long German sentence may be illustrated by the following passage, the subject of which is six different ways of disposing of taxes paid in kind :—

"According to the principle that the state ought, if possible to give preference to uniformly high or uniformly increasing rather than to varying profits, according to this principle we repeat, the ways of utilizing indicated in numbers 3-6, which always bring in a uniform income are to be preferred to the selling at the current market prices and to exportation, both of which vis à vis the average price of rice assessed for the payments in kind would sometimes bring profit sometimes loss, but always varying profits" (p. 238).

The English may be doubtful, but there is a fine Irish flavour about varying profits which are sometimes losses.

Professor Mayet has been maltreated in translation, but even in its original German his work belongs to the class of books which are not books. It is chiefly a collection of essays and papers written for various special purposes at different dates, and republished without any consideration of the needs and knowledge of the possible readers. The first 136 pages are a reprint of what we should call a blue-book report on agricultural insurance, prepared for the Japanese Minister of the Interior in 1886. The remainder consists of four Appendices : 1. "Developments" (pp. 139-185), concerned chiefly with the measures to be taken to free the Japanese peasant-farmer from debt ; 2. "The Land Credit Institute and its assistance in the organized colonization of Hokkaido" (pp. 187-215), an abbreviation of a lecture delivered in July, 1883, before Count Yamagata ; 3. "The Reduction of the Land Tax" (pp. 217-253), part of a paper laid before the Japanese department of finance in 1878 ; and 4. "The System of the Agricultural Distress Funds in Japan" (pp. 255-385), written for the German edition of the book in 1888. This last appendix is illustrated by nineteen tables, printed on a magnificent expanse of paper. As it is the only part of the book primarily intended for the European reader, it is by far the most intelligible, and may, perhaps, be useful to Indian administrators. The other three appendices are of almost purely Japanese interest. The body of the work is also chiefly concerned with purely Japanese questions, but it contains some valuable suggestions of more general interest as to the possible extension of insurance against the various risks to which crops and cattle are exposed. The managers of insurance companies would do well to examine these suggestions, and discover whether danger from hailstorms is the only risk which can profitably be undertaken for the farmer.

EDWIN CANNAN.

AGRARWESEN UND AGRARPOLITIK. By ADOLF BUCHENBERGER, President of the Ministry of Finance of the Grand Duchy of Baden. [Vol. II. 641 pp. 8vo. Winter. Leipzig, 1893.]

If anybody had suggested thirty years ago that, in respect of agriculture, England had anything to learn from Germany, not even the most patriotic German would have believed him. But times have changed. The present volume, which forms part of Professor Wagner's new *Encyclopædia of Political Economy*, affords proof that, at any rate in respect of one or two features which a concurrence of circumstances has raised to exceptional importance, Germany has taken the lead of us in the march of progress. Strong in its division of landed property, it has resisted the great wave of agricultural depression at any rate better than ourselves. Its system of technical education, diversified so as to reach all classes, is decidedly better developed. In respect of the organization of agricultural credit, alike mortgage and personal credit, it has distanced us altogether. And its public leaders have learnt to appreciate the fact that, of all remedies for those social troubles which are all more or less traceable to a growing want of well-being among the rural population, this one, of satisfying the needs of credit, of providing means, that is, wherewith to make production more productive and fence the cultivator securely within the stronghold of his little farm, is the most urgently called for and the most efficient. Lastly, it almost looks as if, in respect of co-operative association—for supply, for work, for insurance and otherwise—the Germans were in a fair way of outstripping us.

However, not all that Germany has to show is pure gain. There are, as it happens, two opposing movements actively at work in the empire, both of which the various Governments find themselves compelled by political necessity to humour—the one protective, seeking to buttress large properties and prop up the decaying larger peasantry by partial laws, which exempt the succeeding heir from taxation, even decree a special valuation of his property in his favour, make the latter indivisible, declare mortgages permanent, and provide similar safeguards; and, secondly, and mainly, by a protective tariff: the other aiming at democratizing agriculture more and more in accordance with the teaching of well-proved experience.

Herr Buchenberger, who has since the appearance of his first volume received well-merited promotion to the presidency of the Baden Ministry of Finance, would not be a German if, in spite of all the unanswerable arguments which he quotes against it, he did not persuade himself that, after all, there must be some good in qualified protection, and at the same time cast a wistful and envious glance at the United

States "Homestead Law," which, up to a certain point, secures even to an encumbered proprietor the possession of his farm. Probably it is rather his deference to public opinion in his country which prompts this reasoning than his own clear head. For of all men, it is he to whom Germany is mainly beholden for that most instructive and opportune official inquiry which has made it abundantly clear that it is everywhere the *small* cultivator—who knows his land, who can devote to it most attention and the largest amount of labour, who in bad times does not trouble about a "living wage" but rather pinches to maintain his independence, and who practically produces in the cheapest market and sells in the dearest—who manages best to hold his own. That discovery has led to interesting measures which one would like to have seen more fully described—measures which only a few weeks ago the greatest living authority on agricultural policy in Germany, Geheimrath Meitzen, described to the writer as "one of the greatest social reforms taken in hand in our days"—the cutting up of large estates, where there is a willing owner, into small holdings; the peopling thereby of an uninhabited plain with a sturdy, pushing, peasant population, which pays more taxes, provides more soldiers for the army, and more citizens and greater wealth for the community, and shows a welcome disinclination to emigrate; and all this with no other aid from the State than the use of its credit and its supervision, to the benefit alike of buyers and of sellers. British Farmers may be glad to receive from President Buchenberger's pen the comforting assurance that the great agricultural depression seems drawing to an end. The present volume is marked by all the thorough study and convenient arrangement of contents which have secured such great praise to the first, and it is equally well got up.

HENRY W. WOLFF.

THE CIVILIZATION OF CHRISTENDOM; and Other Studies.

By BERNARD BOSANQUET, M.A. [vii., 383 pp. Crown 8vo. Sonnenschein. London, 1893.]

This is a book full of fine thought and discerning criticism on social subjects. There is, however, a marked difference of tone between different essays. The least satisfactory—those which give the impression of dilettantism and superficial treatment—are those which touch on distinctively religious questions. In these, Mr. Bosanquet seems to be chiefly concerned in making clear his own intellectual position. While disclaiming for himself the name "Christian" in its strict sense, he holds that the modern spirit can with no propriety be called heathen. "The spirit of Christendom . . . and the modern spirit are on the whole convertible terms" (p. 73). This strange, and,

to a Christian, sinister conception is only possible for one who, like Mr. Bosanquet, believes that Christianity is the product of a natural development, not "a new thing contrasting with the degradation of the Pagan World," but "the issue of the advance of that world during four centuries." Paganism was virtually the "parent" of Christianity (p. 44), which is "a Western religion, a Greek revolt against Judaism," etc. This view, developed in the earlier essays, is not one suitable for discussion in these pages. On the whole the writer's attitude towards Christianity may be described as that of a critic who has moral interests seriously at heart, and who is prepared to admit that the Christian view of life, if disjoined from ideas and doctrines "no longer intelligible" (p. 71), represents an essentially higher morality than that of non-Christian thought. The discussion as to the real meaning and appropriateness of the term Agnostic (which is deprecated by Mr. Bosanquet) is not of general interest, and seems in some measure to interrupt the continuity of the book. It is when he comes to the sixth and following papers that the Christian reader will find himself standing on common ground with Mr. Bosanquet, and will be able cordially to welcome many of his suggestions.

In Essay vi. the writer discusses the "communication of moral ideas as a function of an ethical society." The subject is of great importance, but the essay is disappointing: it seems to promise much, but is too vague and abstract to give serviceable guidance. "What," asks the writer, "is our most general principle?" The answer he gives is, "The sufficiency of humanity." "What," he continues, "is our duty to the suffering, the ignorant, the unleisured? Why, I suppose, to enter into their lives and to make their own humanity appeal to them" (p. 196). Again, "What message have we for the working man or woman? The general form of the answer must be that which we have given above; our message, as we deliver it, cannot be the *idea about morality*, which is expressed by saying that humanity is sufficient for itself; it must be rather those moral ideas by which, in the various ranks and phases of life, humanity is made to feel and to be in very truth sufficient for itself." We can hardly feel that this "message to the poor" (p. 202) satisfies the demand for practical guidance in dealing with them.

Essay vii. is more definite and positive in statement. Thus (p. 226) the writer touches on the subject of the unemployed wisely and sympathetically. He points out the dangers of "sentimentalism," which, as he truly says, is too often insincere because "joined with grave irregularities of method" (p. 231). Essay viii. discourses pleasantly of "training in enjoyment." Something might be said by

those who have the moral care of young men, in qualification of the remark about athleticism as a subject of "facile and effortless conversation" (p. 263). The Essay on "Luxury" is marred by some vagueness, as when the writer says, "The sum and substance of the whole matter is the importance of making it a duty to adapt our surroundings to the highest aims of life" (p. 302).

The most interesting and valuable paper is the tenth ("Individualism and Socialism"), read before the Fabian Society in 1890. The writer's remarks on thrift are timely and valuable (pp. 335-337; cp. pref., p. vi.); but the best point of his paper is the observation (p. 346) that in dealing with questions of relief, etc., there is a "tendency to adapt machinery to dealing with a large effect, superficially apparent, without distinguishing the very different classes of cause, demanding different means for their neutralization, which concur in producing this large apparent effect." The whole essay is strong in its grasp of the delicate problems of character which "economic" as opposed to "moral" socialism (the distinction is Mr. Bosanquet's) too often disregards. Nothing can illustrate the truth of the matter better than the passage on education (pp. 351, 352), and the general remark: "In dealing with the Social organism he (the Economic Socialist) is dealing with a structure whose units are the characters of men and women; and in so far as he neglects to base his arrangements on the essence of character—that is, on the social or moral will—so far he is not dealing with the social organism as an organism, but rather as a machine" (p. 357). This Essay is fundamentally true as an exposition of principles, and is throughout admirable in tone and spirit. Indeed the book contains many statements full of force, and discrimination. See (*e.g.*) the suggestive words about the Dark Ages (pp. 89, 90), the passages about Thoroughness (excellent, pp. 181-183), and the thoughtful remark, "It is the affirmative that wins, and convinces, and inspires" (p. 137). The only complaint to be urged against the book is, that the title leads us to expect a more thorough and discerning treatment of the religious questions touched upon than we actually find.

R. L. OTTLEY.

PAROCHIAL SELF-GOVERNMENT IN RURAL DISTRICTS.

By HENRY C. STEPHENS, M.P. [Second Edition. 270 pp. 1s. Longmans. London, 1893.]

Mr. Stephens has done well to reprint, in the form of a shilling volume, a book which appeared originally in a luxurious, wide-margined quarto at 12s. 6d. Though, unfortunately, it is too late to hope that Mr. Stephens's suggestions will have much influence upon

the scheme of Parochial Government now before Parliament, the book deserves serious attention alike from practical politicians and from students of political and social philosophy.

Mr. Stephens's main contention is that in rural districts local affairs can be most efficiently and economically administered by the parish itself, *i.e.* by the people who know the wants of the neighbourhood, who are most interested in supplying them, and who know the persons to whom they delegate the actual management of their affairs. This principle of local self-government Mr. Stephens defends against (1) centralization, whether in the form of interference by Government departments, or by merging the parish in larger rural areas; and (2) representative government, *i.e.* the surrender of control over local affairs to bodies or officials elected for a considerable fixed term. The result of such a surrender is, he contends, that the people themselves practically lose control over and interest in their own affairs. Mr. Stephens's ideal (which is embodied in a parliamentary Bill) is government by the people themselves in open parish meeting; election, at such meetings, of officials and committees who should be directly responsible to, constantly controlled by, and at any moment removable by the parish meeting. It is admitted that rural bodies require some control, but this control should be exercised by local bodies governing a larger area, *i.e.* (in the case of an English parish) the County Council. Subject to this control, he would make over to the parish itself the administration of outdoor relief, pecuniary responsibility for the poor in the Union or District Work-house, the duties now performed by school-boards or school attendance committees, rural sanitary authorities, highway boards, etc., and as much of the work of the County Council as is of directly local import.

In support of the principles upon which this scheme is founded, Mr. Stephens produces much historical evidence. In particular he contends that the poor-law, under parochial management (in accordance with the Acts of Elizabeth) had, by the time of George I., "almost extirpated pauperism." The grave mismanagement and appalling growth of pauperism which is commonly associated with the "old poor-law" is traced entirely to the interference by Justices which began with 3 and 4 William and Mary, cap. 11, and was largely extended by 9 George I., cap. 7, eventually extinguishing through the greater part of England the last relics of real parochial self-government. At the same time there were particular parishes which, owing to local circumstances, were able practically to evade the control of the Justices and to keep the administration of the poor-law in their own hands. Among these was the parish of Finchley, the accounts

and vestry minutes of which, from 1780 to 1841, are printed *in extenso* as a specimen of what real parochial self-government can do. Whatever may be thought of Mr. Stephens's scheme for parochial government at the present day, there can be no doubt that in the historical part of his argument he has a strong case, and has presented it in an extremely interesting fashion.

With many of the principles upon which Mr. Stephens's scheme is based, it is impossible not heartily to agree. Whether there are no considerations on the other side which would have to be taken account of in any workable legislative measure, is more doubtful. Mr. Stephens is, no doubt, right in deprecating that love of uniformity for its own sake which is the dominant vice of the official mind; but we may doubt whether a little more of it is not practically expedient than is always recognized by Mr. Stephens. Local government, without some means of compelling an inert authority to do its duty, would often mean no government at all; and officials or committees not subject to periodical re-election would sometimes become even more irresponsible than (according to Mr. Stephens) they are now. The re-introduction of the parish's responsibility for its own poor would work hardly in many cases: a landlord could evade his share in the responsibility by taking care that no elderly persons acquired a settlement in his "close" parishes, and driving them into the next open parish; while a parish which chanced to possess a large village with a small acreage—its people working in adjoining parishes—would be overmuch burdened. So, again, we may doubt whether the inferences which Mr. Stephens draws from the working of the open vestry system, at a time when it is improbable that any one below the rank of a small tradesman or farmer would practically have ventured to take much part in parish business, are applicable without qualification to a time when the labourers, though by no means incapable of taking part in the management of their own affairs, might here and there be unduly influenced by the local wire-puller anxious to win popularity and power through a lax administration of the poor-law. All that Mr. Stephens says on the subject of poor-law administration is, however, worthy of the most serious attention; and, after a little experience of the working of the new Government Bill, it is not impossible that in this department some of Mr. Stephens's suggestions may still bear fruit. In particular, we may hope that attention will be directed to his remarks on the evil effects of entrusting the administration of the rates to persons who do not personally contribute to them—a system introduced by the Acts which allowed "compounding for rates." With regard to other parts of the scheme, I am sanguine

enough to hope that the Parish Councils Bill, though far from realizing Mr. Stephens's ideal, may practically give the parishioners a greater share in, and interest in, parish business than he himself anticipates.

In conclusion, I cannot help alluding to the interest with which the academic student of political philosophy will notice the testimony borne by a practical writer like Mr. Stephens, and by the modern experience which he cites, to two fundamental ideas of Aristotle, often set aside as characteristically, if not ridiculously, "Greek," viz. (1) that for the *πόλις* to work well, it must not be too large for the citizens to know each other, and (2) that representative government is not really the same thing as *self*-government.

H. RASHDALL.

A SOCIAL POLICY FOR THE CHURCH; and other Papers on Social Subjects. By the REV. T. C. FRY, D.D., Headmaster of Berkhamsted School. [128 pp. Crown 8vo. 2s. Rivington, Percival & Co. London, 1893.]

Three of these papers have already appeared in the *Economic Review*, and their author is well known to its readers as an enthusiastic social reformer. The policy for the Church advocated in the first three papers may be stated thus: There is a social question; the condition of the labouring classes, that is of a large majority of the people, needs amelioration, of which they are conscious and for which they are striving; hence the opportunity for the Church to step in and head the movement of progress; and this, not from any interested motives, but from true sympathy with men, and in the fulfilment of her mission, which is to uphold justice and freedom as well as to save souls. This policy is pressed home with all the incisive and vigorous energy which marks Dr. Fry's style, and which makes these papers veritable "goads" to awaken the social conscience.

In Paper II. the question is considered "What can the clergy do?" in regard to which not a few of the clergy are anxious to know the best answer. Dr. Fry generously admits "the long, noble history of their devotion; . . . they do feel deeply for the poor" (p. 61). And we are assured of this when we remember the quiet work that has been done in many a country parish; the starting of schools long before national education was thought of; the attempts to enliven and educate by entertainments, classes, night schools, etc.; the care of the individual poor and sick; the active agitation against intemperance; the sympathy which has helped and encouraged and won the love of all classes. "But they are not sympathetic with the progressive movement." This charge must be allowed. The lack of sympathy

however is not *always* due to fear of offending the powers that be, or of alienating influential subscribers to church expenses. It is largely due to want of conviction. The clergyman desires the welfare of the poor as earnestly as the social reformer, but he is not so "fully assured" that that welfare is best advanced by such and such a programme. As is clearly pointed out in Paper V., the content of the idea of Right varies from age to age, and therefore also its concrete expression in particular Rights. The clergy, then, cannot in fairness be expected to jump all at once from one set of ideas to another, and to commit the Church to a theory of Rights which may perhaps be discarded by a future generation. Hence, for the present time of transition, this seems the wisest course, which is recommended on p. 40: it is not the mission of the clergy, we are told, "to dogmatize on social reforms. Those amongst them who are experts have as much right to their opinions as any one else; those who are not experts, should at least be students: but experts will not, and students ought not to, dogmatize. The best of us are, after all, as yet but learners in economics. The evolution of social life is making new truth as it goes. At least let us be humble and learn, if need be, from our gardeners; but on economic subjects do not let us lay down any law of the Medes and Persians."

There is indeed a suggestion which might have been added to those in this paper; that is, to set an example of simplicity of life. The struggle between Capital and Labour is for a fairer distribution of the good things of this life. These may be necessities, but they are still material. And, while many of us may deeply sympathize with those who have not a fair share, not even the minimum which we reckon necessary, it is the special office of the clergy to counteract the inevitable tendency to materialism, to bear witness to both parties of the existence and the importance of other needs. It is this anti-materialism which is so striking a part of our Lord's social teaching; and while it is Dives who is most open to the temptation of resting upon his worldly goods, yet a miner or artisan who exhausts a fair wage in beer and beefsteaks stands no less in need of a warning. Do we, then, want the rich to surrender their superfluity? let us set an example of self-sacrifice. Do we desire to help the poor? by coming to them, sharing their hardships as far as may be, we shall give the truest proof of sympathy.

Dr. Fry, however, is quite capable of seeing both sides of the question. In Paper IV. he speaks to working men; and after very clearly accounting for the changes in our ideas of Right, he gives them some very good advice as to their own temptations. Such advice or

.

warning is greatly needed, for there is a danger lest victory should be spoilt by indulgence and excess, by selfishness and unfairness. A working man, of course, cannot be expected to be ideally moral, any more than an employer; but as he is not at present much attached to the Church, it is the more incumbent on his leaders to give the needful "doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness." An instance of this necessity is given in Paper V., where the disastrous social issue of the present popular feeling about divorce is clearly pointed out, and Dr. Fry strongly maintains the mission and duty of the Church to insist on eternal principles, such as the permanence of the marriage bond, however much they run counter to the popular current.

To conclude, these papers are full of zeal, the policy they advocate is in truest accord with the mission of the Church, and their circulation cannot but do much good in arousing the conscience, especially of Churchmen.

R. B. RACKHAM.

A DISCOURSE OF THE COMMON WEAL OF THIS REALM OF ENGLAND. First printed in 1581. Edited from the Manuscripts by the late ELIZABETH LAMOND. [208 pp. Crown 8vo. 5s. University Press. Cambridge, 1893.]

This book is interesting from several points of view: in the first place a pathetic interest attaches to it, for Miss Lamond did not live to see its completion, but, after working at it till within four or five days of her death, she left it to be completed by the able and sympathetic hand of Dr. Cunningham. Again, the "Discourse" has had a curious history, which has been unravelled in a masterly way and is clearly set forth in Dr. Cunningham's introduction. It was first printed in 1581, as the work of W. S., and, till lately, has been taken to be an Elizabethan document; but the editors, from study of the two known manuscripts, show good reason for believing that it was written in 1549 by John Hales.

This conclusion not only enables the dialogue to be set in its proper historical place, but also further elucidates it by identifying the locality and personages of the dialogue. The scene is Coventry; the Knight and the Doctor, who bear the principal parts in art, are found to be John Hales himself and Bishop Latimer.

After following eagerly the masterly argument which establishes bit by bit these important points, the reader naturally turns with increased zest to the dialogue itself.

It is already well known to students of Economic History, and that

not only from the misleading printed edition of 1581 and the reprints ; for Miss Lamond's preliminary discussion of its real date in the *English Historical Review* was published in time to secure its being estimated at its proper value both by Dr. Cunningham, in the *second* edition of his *Growth of English Industry and Commerce*, and by Prof. Ashley in his *Economic History*, vol. i., pt. ii. (In the former place a brief analysis is given of the dialogue.) But just because it is a well-recognized authority it is all the more satisfactory to have such a scholarly and accurate edition of it as the present.

Further, from the point of view of history in a more general sense, it is of great value as giving a vivid picture of the state of society in the time of Edward VI. ; the writing is concise and skilful, and the dramatic power shown in handling the various characters such as even to make less ludicrous than it seems at first sight the old proposal to identify the W. S. of the edition of 1581 with William Shakespeare !

W. H. FRERE.

THE EMANCIPATION OF WOMEN AND ITS PROBABLE
CONSEQUENCES. By ADELE CREPAZ. [130 pp. Crown
8vo. 2s. 6d. Sonnenschein. London, 1893.]

This little *brochure*, which has received Mr. Gladstone's imprimatur in the shape of a short letter to the authoress, is written from the point of view of the *Ewig Weibliche*. Beginning with a glance at the position of the women of antiquity, Frau Crepaz dates the movement towards emancipation from a meeting of American ladies held in the year 1848 at Seneca Hall, a small town in New York State, at which it was resolved that "the one half of humanity, weighted with equal responsibilities and with duties as exalted, demands equal rights with the other physically stronger half." A few years later, the census of 1856 (*sic* according to Frau Crepaz) forced upon public attention in England the fact that two millions of the female half of the population were dependent on their own exertions for subsistence. The Society for the Employment of Women was speedily established, and since then, as everybody knows, there has not been a calling in life, except the muscular ones, which has not either been won, or at least invaded, by women, until at last, to quote our authoress, "in Parliament alone women have no voice."

After naming the United States and England as the countries in which the women's question has advanced the furthest, and France and the States of Southern Europe as those in which it has made least way, Frau Crepaz launches herself on the full tide of her subject.

Her thesis is the familiar one that matrimony and maternity constitute the one grand outlet for feminine faculties, and she argues that to throw themselves into the arena of competition as breadwinners must inevitably disqualify women for their one true mission in life. She accepts it as proved that there are women who fully hold their own against the average man in what are generally regarded as distinctly masculine occupations. But she points out, and with reason, that the triumphs won until now in the academic field by women-students over men afford no accurate measure of the relative powers of the sexes, for these are unequally matched. The private soldiers of the one sex are pitted against the picked champions of the other. Not until the rank and file of both the opposing forces are included in the fray can the contest be accepted as fair. The result of the industrial enfranchisement of women (using the adjective in its broadest sense) would be, according to Frau Crepaz, to intensify the struggle for existence for both sexes—for men, inasmuch as they would have to contend against the cheaper labour of women ; and for women, because men, undersold by them, would be less able to support the luxury of a household, and because they would be handicapped by lack of strength and staying power. John Stuart Mill's contention that inequality in point of physical power between the sexes springs rather from training and heredity than from any immutable law of nature, is rejected ; and, indeed, it seems but reasonable and consonant with observed facts to assume that, since so large a proportion of a woman's strength is specialized, she should have less at command for the general purposes of life than a man. Had it been otherwise, history would not have to record the degradation of women during the ages and in the countries where force has reigned supreme. Frau Crepaz opposes with equal decision the argument advanced by a German society for promoting the employment of women, that men will find it to their advantage to have wives with business or professional training who can become fellow-breadwinners with their husbands. She alleges that the result would be a reduction in the market value of the man's labour. Man and wife together would earn what the man before was able to earn by himself. She considers art and literature the only pursuits which women are fitted to share with men, and makes no exception in favour of medicine.

Our authoress, in the very positive generalization of her sex's powers with which she favours us, allows too little for individual variations from the normal type. Here in England, at any rate, it will be acknowledged that there exists among us a numerically large section of the female population whose services are of distinct, and sometimes

of unique, value to the community in other channels than that of matrimony, and another—possibly larger—section which, whatever other direction its talents may take, is certainly not adapted for married life. The social scheme ought to be wide enough to allow free scope to these minorities, no less than to the majority, for the exercise of the faculties with which nature has endowed them. The *cruz* of the problem to be solved lies here,—how to allow opportunity for the healthy development of the exceptional type without at the same time stimulating departure from the normal type, which, in the case of women, it must be conceded to Frau Crepaz, is that of wife and mother.

C. H. D'E. LEPPINGTON.

THE NEW REFORMATION AND ITS RELATION TO MORAL AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS. By RAMSDEN BALMFORTH. [159 pp. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. Sonnenschein. London, 1893.]

This book consists of a reprint of a series of papers that appeared in the pages of the *Westminster Review*, written under the pseudonym of "Leon Ramsay," to which are appended two additional chapters, somewhat slightly connected with the former part of the work, but giving an account of the political and social ideals of the author. The phrase, "The New Reformation," is avowedly adopted from Mrs. Humphrey Ward, and is used to express the general, somewhat vague devotion to truth, righteousness, and the good of our fellow-men which some people tell us must supersede and replace all and every definite form of religion. The exposition of this occupies Mr. Balmforth's first four chapters, and is often forcible, and even beautiful.

We must rejoice unreservedly whenever it is pointed out how far better it is to be just, pure, true, and self-sacrificing, rather than mean, selfish, false, or cruel; and so far we can fully endorse the writer's vigorous argument. It is, however, hard to agree with him when, following Matthew Arnold, he maintains that devotion to a "stream of tendency by which all things seek to fulfil the law of their being" will prove a motive more likely to wean the mass of mankind from self-seeking than love and loyalty to a personal Ruler, who is Love; or that an inarticulate aspiration towards "the eternal power not ourselves that makes for righteousness," will bring to one struggling to overcome a deadly temptation as real help and strength as a cry to an Almighty Saviour who can succour the tempted, "in that He also suffered being tempted." Consequently it does not seem to be likely that "the New Reformation" will prove a very great power to regenerate the world.

The book gives melancholy signs that the writer regards that selfish,

unworthy survival from the mode of thought of the eighteenth century—which I think it was Kingsley stigmatized as “other-worldliness”—as being the genuine teaching of the Christian Church.

It is not easy to see how the Socialist principles which form the subject of the concluding chapters follow from the ethical teaching of the earlier portion of the book. The remarks upon Carlyle, Ruskin, and Matthew Arnold in the last chapter are interesting. We can never estimate the debt the world owes to those three great teachers for bringing into prominence the principles of justice and truth, of which most men had but too completely lost sight; but we can hardly believe that the bulk of our working men will draw their teaching directly from them, at least for some little time to come.

On the whole the book does not appear to be of very great importance; but every exposition of ethics divorced from Christian truth should prove a useful reminder that it is the bounden duty of all of us to give in our own lives living testimony that Christianity means, not selfishness, but love.

E. A. PEARSON.

SHORT NOTICES.

PRINCIPES D'ÉCONOMIE POLITIQUE. Par CHARLES GIDE, Professeur d'Économie Politique à la Faculté de Droit de Montpellier. [vii., 638 pp. Crown 8vo. 6 francs. Larose. Paris, 1894.]

A fourth edition of Professor Gide's work has just appeared. The book has obtained such general recognition as an economical manual of first-rate excellence, that little comment is necessary. In a general preface, Professor Gide thanks his various critics for their suggestions, which have led him to modify points of detail, although the scheme of the work is unaltered. Among additions in the new issue are (1) a chapter on the history of economic doctrines, and (2) on the history of protection; also (3) some fresh notices of economic legislation. The book may now be said to be “brought up to date,” and contains, in a small compass, a vast amount of information, wit, and wisdom.

THE MARK IN EUROPE AND AMERICA. By ENOCH A. BRYAN, A.M., President of Vincennes University, Indiana. [vi., 164 pp. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. Ginn. Boston, 1893.]

Mr. Bryan has done good service by his presentment of the case for and against the Teutonic mark as it now stands. After a short statement of all the arguments which are based on the assumption of

a primitive Teutonic village-community, owning land, he subjects the evidence on which that assumption rests to a searching scrutiny. Tacitus, he claims, gives no ground for it when his language is analyzed. "Superest ager" means "There is enough land and to spare." And if Tacitus gives no hint of the economic mark, still less does he hint at the political; his picture of ancient Germany abounds with gradations of rank and dignity which are incompatible with the democratic ideal which some writers claim to find embodied in his facts. Cæsar is equally guiltless of an allusion to the assumed mark. In early German law the word is used as = *terminus*, and never as an area of land. English history is similarly mute on the subject. When we come to institutions which are held to presuppose the mark, the chain of proof is stronger; but the argument is not convincing, for the complexity of causes has been under-rated. An interesting feature of his book is his treatment of the settlement of New England, and the explanation which he gives of its various features, which, in his judgment, grew out of far less dramatic material than a revival of a primitive institution. The book is well worth reading, although, perhaps, it is not quite so impartial as its writer thinks.

ENGLISH COMMERCE AND COLONIES, FROM ELIZABETH TO VICTORIA. By H. DE B. GIBBINS, M.A. [136 pp. Crown 8vo. 2s. Methuen. London, 1893.]

This is one of a series of handbooks for young men training for commercial life, or for use in schools where industrial history is taught. The subject treated of is one of great importance in English history, and it is handled shortly but with great clearness, and not without a considerable degree of interest, by Mr. Gibbins. The facts are well chosen, accurate, and well grouped. In the Preface the author refers to the assistance he has received from Professor Bastable, whose collaboration is in itself a guarantee of the accuracy of the information given. The account of the British Empire as it is at present, which is given at the end of the last chapter, is a contribution of great value in promoting the knowledge of his country that every Englishman ought to possess; and there is a note on Authorities, borrowed from the *Dictionary of Political Economy*, that will help towards acquiring a more complete acquaintance with the subject.

MORAL THREADS IN SOCIAL WEBS.¹

WHEN your committee asked me whether I would open your course of lectures with an address on some social subject, I was greatly tempted to decline. For I am not an expert in those subjects: and our great need is to understand how hard they are, and how little use it is to talk about them unless you are an expert and have given them some real thought and special study. But I was very loth to refuse such a request coming from an important body of the working-classes of our town, and from the co-operative body in particular; and, most of all, I was unwilling to disappoint those members of that body who strive to keep to the front the intellectual and moral element in the co-operative movement.

And so I turned to consider what it was possible to do. And when I did so, it occurred to me that there was a thought which is brought again and again before us by reading books on social and economical matters, and by daily experience: a thought of great importance, and yet easily overlooked,—and one which had for me the advantage of not requiring difficult proof or exhaustive treatment; which it would suffice to indicate, and illustrate by a few unmethodical illustrations. And further, it seemed to me of a sort which, without being professional, was suitable for a clerical lecturer, who, claiming no more than an amateur knowledge of social and economical matters, must feel a wish to help others to realize their great importance to human well-being.

For the thought or truth is this, that those things which we call social and economical are greatly governed and influenced by those causes and influences which we call moral; or, more

¹ A lecture read at the People's Hall, Leeds, on Oct. 14, 1893, at the opening of the Co-operative Society's Lectures for 1893-4.

simply, that the things of getting and spending, buying, selling, paying wages, and earning them, are influenced by the things of character and conduct. And so I chose the title which I thought would help my meaning by an illustration, and, in a great textile centre, I call my subject, "Moral Threads in Social Webs."

Now, there is nothing like a contrast for helping to make a thing clear or show its importance. It is plain what the contrast will be in the case before us. It will be to suppose that our industrial and economical system is governed by laws which are independent of character, which "go of themselves," and are not to be influenced by us; that it resembles in fact a machine, though a very delicate and complicated machine. The extreme form of this supposition would be that bad men and good men can make an equally good and flourishing economical system. This probably few would be found to assert. But I think that a good deal which has been taught and said goes a long way in this direction. The necessities of trade, the state of the market, competition, and other such-like things have been spoken of as if they were great blind dumb forces which men had nothing to do with making or altering or chiding; but which dealt with us as they would. This was, I think, very characteristic of what we now call the older Political Economy. Its writers delighted to dwell on the delicacy of the economical machine, the balance of its parts, its safety valves, and its self-regulating powers. They told us at the beginning that they were going to deal with human beings in a way which got rid of troublesome differences of character. They had only to do with them in connection with the getting of wealth, and in that respect they might all be treated as fairly alike. Men would all wish to live: they would all wish to buy cheaply and sell dearly; they would all wish to make the best bargain they could for themselves. The problem was to watch and trace what happened when they set about the business. It is quite true that political economy made its reserves. It carefully told us that it was not a teacher of duty; not of what ought to be, but of what was. It carefully told us that there were other parts of

human nature beside the economical parts. Only it said that one need not pay attention to them for the purposes of study. And, since what is out of sight is out of mind, so it came to pass that when men talked of markets, and prices, and wages, and production, and distribution, they got to think of all this as a world in which duty, character, sentiment, and such-like things had no place; and all was ruled for us by laws which we had only to watch. The machine ran its course; and we were not responsible for its results. This, if the results were sad or disastrous, was of course "comfortable doctrine." Besides, if things got very bad, they would, it was taught, right themselves.

Now, this description is dry work. Let me give you an example of the sort of way in which the old economy trusted to the mechanical balance of things to look after itself. It was argued that the amount of money available for wages at any given time was fixed and unalterable; that the reduction of wages in one place only meant therefore increase of wages in another; that if employers reduced wages too far, nobody need be troubled, since the increase in profit thus made went either to benefit the consumer by cheapening the article, and so, by giving the consumer more money to spend, encouraged trade, and so returned to wages again; or else it went to the employer, who would at once spend more in employing, with the same result of restoring to wages what had been taken from them. To us such abstract arguments sound astonishing: they ignore, *e.g.*, the fact that what the sweated labourer loses, even if it ultimately finds its way to some labourer's pocket, may never come to his or to that of any in his line of employment; or, again, that employers do not always spend increased profits in employment.

But let us look to another and very opposite quarter, and see whether there is not something of the very same inclination to overrate mechanical and underrate moral influences. Socialism, broadly speaking, is the very opposite of the old economy: and one feature of this opposition is that Socialism insists very strongly on moral conditions. Its rearrangement of society is to

be the result of moral improvement, to be kept going by moral improvement, and to produce moral improvement. And yet, fully allowing this, is it not true that Socialists are often tempted to speak and think as though all that is needed is a mere economic change, as though the common ownership or the nationalization of the instruments of production would of itself work great things? I think in what Socialists say you will often find these two things side by side, very little reconciled: (1) "Let us have anyhow and at once our new economical world;" (2) "Our new economical world will require for its working a vast improvement of morality, which it may take generations or centuries to make." But there is no more magic in common or public ownership than there is in the balance of economical forces or other such old-fashioned securities of social welfare. They are alike mechanical, and our webs must have moral threads.

And here, perhaps, I should stop to explain and apologize for my words. I am talking of moral and mechanical, and contrasting them with one another, and using both, I fear, very loosely. But you have seen what I mean by mechanical—I mean those things which go of themselves without requiring character. And so by moral forces I mean such as character makes. I think the word has both a wider and a narrower sense. In the narrower sense "moral" is our epithet for the conduct of one who knows what "ought" means and does what he ought. (Or if we add to it a noun of blame, and speak, *e.g.*, of "moral" cowardice, it points to the failure to see the "ought" or do it.) In the wider sense "moral" may be stretched to mean that which is not merely physical. The needs of the body to be fed, warmed, and the rest are physical; the needs of the affections, imagination, ambitions are more or less "moral;" and whatever forces or threads these latter make are "moral" forces or "moral" threads.

My use of the word here covers both senses. It is perhaps in this wider sense that we find a moral thread in the claim for what, as the phrase goes, is a "living wage." Evidently there is a point below which wages will not go: that

point is the sum on which a man can get the food which keeps him alive, and makes him willing and able to bring up a family. But directly we ask what this sum is, we see that we are not dealing with a matter of merely physical need. Undoubtedly the character of a people's food, whether it be poor and cheap, as the Irish potato or the Indian rice, or dearer and better, as the English wheaten bread and "something to it," is what does most to determine the necessary wage. But is it not plain that other causes may have their part, and that some of these are moral? We could do with less wages if we went naked; if we are decent enough to ask for clothing necessary wages will be higher; and so every influence which goes to determine a man's idea of what a decent livelihood and a decent home are goes to affect the figure of the minimum wage in that place, time, and occupation. "The term 'necessary wages,'" says an economist, "must be understood in each country and community according to the habitual standard of living there maintained." This, then, is, I take it, the truth of the "living wage" doctrine. Moral as well as physical causes go to fix the minimum. It is right to add one or two remarks. (1) It is one thing to say what I have just said; and quite another to take a particular figure at a particular moment and label it "living wage." The first is a general truth; the second is an attempt to apply it. This may be wisely or unwisely done. (2) The demand for a living wage against the pressure of the market is always made at a risk. There may be a margin which can be cut off from profits or put on to prices at the expense of the employer or the customer respectively to raise or maintain the wage. In that case there will be a certain redistribution of the results of industry. This, I take it, is what the miners believe to be possible in the present crisis. But there may not be such a margin. And in that case the living wage can be obtained only at the cost of squeezing out some employers and some labourers; the least profitable pits or factories, those which are working at a bare profit, will have to go; and there will be a consequent reduction of employment. The demand for a living wage is, then, always made at a risk; only let us fairly notice this is not peculiar to a morally necessary

wage ; a bare subsistence (or physically necessary) wage may be in some cases more than a certain trade can bear, at any rate in its weaker places. Obviously, then, those weaker places must go. And it may well be better that this should be so even in cases where the necessity is moral.

I will not pursue the matter further ; you will see I think its economical difficulty, and perhaps we may be a little slower to condemn on one side and the other than we have been tempted to be.

But now this suggests another instance of my moral threads which is easier and indeed familiar. Marriages, it is often said, vary with the price of corn ; and, therefore, perhaps with the buying-power of the population of which that price is an element. Out of this rises a fear which has been the very bugbear of economists, and often thrown a gloom over all thoughts about human progress. It is a fear which argues in this way. Improve men's condition ; cheapen their food ; raise their wages : what will be the result ? It will all be futile. The result will be that more will marry, and more will be brought up. There will be an increase in the supply of labour, and so it will be cheapened ; wages will fall, and you will be round again at the old point. The argument underrates a moral force, which is this, that a certain standard of decency and comfort acts as a safeguard to itself. We can see this by its opposite. Which are the populations most reckless in marrying ? They are those which in greatest destitution have least self-respect. This has been one of the main causes of Irish trouble. This is one of the worst features in parts of the East End of London, and wherever slums are found. The weakness of the moral influences then becomes an economical factor so disastrous that many have felt it all-powerful for evil.

And, perhaps, no instances of the interworking of moral and economical causes are more tragical than those where some scarcity or commercial catastrophe, reducing a whole locality or trade to a lower level, so breaks their *morale* and self-respect that they remain afterwards on that level without energy to rise. The case of the silk-workers in Spitalfields is quoted as an

instance in point. Perhaps France with its population brought to a standstill by the force of prudence is another instance; which, however questionable morally as to its methods, and politically as to its results, at least shows the strength of non-material influences in these respects. And while we are speaking of morals as an economic force I would ask you what you think of slave-labour as an instance. Why is slave-labour economically so bad? Is it not for a moral reason, and because under slavery the best springs of energy in a man, self-respect, responsibility, hope, are not touched? The slave works by compulsion and works ill.

Now let us make a jump to another part of the subject, and to a far-away part of the world, and let me tell you a story as it was told to me by a friend who had held a high position as a Government servant in India. It was the time of one of those famines which are the affliction of that country. They could watch the failure of the rice coming on gradually towards starvation point. Now, my friend had been duly brought up on the old mechanical views. Demand and supply, and their dependence one on another, were words the very sound of which made him comfortable and confident. The distance from Calcutta and its port was only sixty miles. There were probably hidden reserves in the country itself. Demand would provoke supply, and all would be well. Only, as the days went by, all did not seem well. Things went on, the demand rose to a cry of death-agony; and famine began to do its dreadful work right and left. But no sign of the supplies. Still, like brave and true men, the officials clung to their principles, giving personal charity, but taking no other action. Any benevolent action of Government would do harm and not good; it would check the wholesome play of the law of supply and demand. They held out as long as they could; but at last the head had to yield to the heart; or, rather, the logic of fact was stronger than the logic of theory. In sheer charity the Government force was put in motion to bring up artificially a supply of rice. And, then, behold what happened! the forces of demand and supply which had seemed frozen or paralyzed yielded to the touch of charity.

As if a spring had been pressed, the machinery began to work. "The quantity imported," I quote his words, "was almost infinitesimal compared to the mere *daily* consumption of the district. But the effect was a miracle." It was found that there were really large stocks in the country which were held back, partly from fear lest if known they should be plundered, partly for a still higher price, partly from the owners' panic at the idea of parting with their own last resources. They had been held back till, as he says, the greater part of the population lay in skeletons around. But now they flowed forth. Note the moral. The old truths of political economy held good. Demand did tend to create supply; only (and this "only" made all the difference), there was one link missing to connect tendency result, and a moral power had to come in and supply it.

Let us make another jump, and this time follow the guidance of a word, the word "credit." It is a word of well-understood commercial import; it represents a thing with an ascertainable money value; it forms one subject of practical economics. And yet who does not see that the word is a moral word, and that the thing itself is moral through and through? The word (akin to "creed" and "credible," and illustrated by its adjective "creditable") has *trust* as its meaning, and trust implies what is moral both in truster and trusted. But as to the thing itself, perhaps you will say, "Don't be so soft as to suppose that commercial credit has moral foundations. It rests partly on calculation and partly on force. If I give a man credit, it is partly because I take the risk, and on a number of transactions it pays me, partly because, if he fails me, I will take the law of him." Yes, that is all very well. Everywhere law, so far as is possible, adds its strength to morality. If you marry two wives the law, as well as morality, will condemn you. All the same the law, unless it is supported and helped by moral forces, is a most clumsy and blundering instrument. It can sometimes be defied, and constantly be evaded; and to invoke it is costly and exhausting. If credit relied only on the prosecution of defaulters it would be a very

contracted thing. And, on the other hand, the usurer of old time, and the blood-sucker of the present, with their enormous rates of interest, are examples of credit without trust. The credit of a country, or of a bank, or of an individual, how surely it depends on trust, either on special character or on average human trustworthiness! Law, interest, policy, public opinion may come in to reinforce this truthworthiness, but it is a moral force.

And leaving credit technically so called, have you ever thought how much the social webs of our complicated life are woven of trust? It is trust which is continually more or less abused; and, accordingly, we pay the penalty in more or less uneasiness and distrust. But, all the same, it does us good service. What a different world it would be if we got nothing from one another except what was yielded either to force or selfish interest! Civil words, courteous ways, pleasant looks, count, I think you will say, for a good deal in the comfort and ease of social dealing. If nobody told us the way in the street unless we paid him for it; if everybody turned off a servant or an employee the moment he could get one worth a trifle more in the market; if we had no security for the quality of any article we bought except our own power to test it, the world would be a vastly more uncomfortable place than it is. We all bear testimony to this when we look out for an honest servant, when we praise a trustworthy firm, or even when we contrast a liberal railway company, which believes in doing the thing well, with one which is always cheese-paring for dividends at the expense of our comfort. I remember hearing that in South America the banks try to get pure-blood Spaniards instead of half-castes, because they have a higher sense of honour. A master in a large establishment knows very well how much he depends on the honesty of his assistants. You may say that all this comes to little more than saying that an honest dealer is better than a dishonest, and that this is a remark hardly worth making. But my reply is that a great deal of people's talk goes far too near to practically denying this, and saying that we have no securities but our own sharpness, the government inspector,

the fear of being found out, and the commercial value of honesty. With regard to this last, let us by all means draw the distinction between the results of honesty and its cause; what makes an honest tradesman is not at all the same as what an honest tradesman makes. He makes a reward for himself, at least generally and in the long run, by the trust which his customers give him; and a man may easily calculate, "I shall gain on the whole by giving my customers a good article." But it is doubtful whether any man ever carried through a really sound honest business without at least some motive better than longheadedness, and there are many cases where the customer's detection of the difference is so uncertain, or other reasons make it seem very doubtful whether honesty is the best policy, where in fact dishonesty may seem to promise a better commercial value than honesty. "A customer cannot in many cases know for himself that he is getting what he wants."

If we could live a day in an *unmoral* world, with no securities but mutual selfish interest and the policemen, we should know the difference quickly and painfully. Alas, the world we know is quite unmoral and immoral enough to give us a good idea of what the discomfort is! But there are economical results too. If it was true that the constant and excessive sizing of Manchester cotton for the Indian market made Indian buyers shy of those goods, and hurt the trade, there was an economic result. If it be true that mistrust of the masters in this strike has been a reason for declining arbitration, then (whether the mistrusters or the mistrusted or both are to blame) this is another example, on a large scale, of economical dislocation and loss aggravated by moral causes.

Your own co-operative movement (if I may venture on that ground where I tread hesitatingly as a stranger while you are at home) illustrates my point, I think, in more ways than one. Is it not true that one main difficulty in the advance of co-operative production is the difficulty of trusting managers? Concerns of that kind want some one who is allowed a free hand, and is trusted to make prompt decisions, and to take big responsibilities. Have there not been many failures of promising schemes on

this account? And for fear of it do not other schemes hang back from starting?

Again, your movement is, I think, a signal instance of what I believe to be again and again true, that a thing is first done on principle, which afterwards is adopted for its utility. I remember being struck when I read Miss Hart's account of the *Maison Leclaire* in Paris, which was such a splendidly successful instance of an attempt to make master and men jointly interested in a business; I was much struck by observing that M. Leclaire began it on the simple ground of principle, from benevolence to the men, and not the least as a 'cute bit of speculation, though the 'cutest dodge could not have turned out, as it happened, more profitable to him. Moral pioneers are not always as fortunate. It was not so with your old veteran, Vansittart Neale, whose early efforts to help your movement cost him, as we know, a fortune. But co-operation is certainly an instance of how men began a movement largely on moral grounds, which has proved itself a material success. You certainly are deeply pledged to remember that industrial well-being has its moral as well as its economical causes, has its springs in conscience as well as in business qualities; or, if you like to put it so, that conscience is one of the best of business qualities. I suppose that prison reform is an instance of a very different kind of the same truth, that conscience initiates and opinion follows. We look upon a clean and humane prison discipline as an obvious necessity on public grounds; but it was Howard's self-denying visits to the prisons which began the change that gave it to us.

I have kept you long enough, and I see how easily one illustration and another may start up and lead us too far, though their very variety proves my point.

Bargaining, for example, and competition are such cases. Travellers in Italy and the East know that shopping has to be done there by the method of haggle. The first price asked is perhaps double what the owner will really take. There is a great deal of talk, strong assertions and protestations; much time is consumed: but at last, perhaps that day or perhaps

another, the price is lowered, and the article sold. To us this process seems wholly bad. The advance of *prix-fixe* is the advance of a higher system morally and economically—one which spares many lies, saves a great deal of time, and gives quickness and steadiness to business. In a good English shop we trust the seller to tell us at first the price which he is really willing—subject to usual discounts—to take. May it not be that moral progress will carry the same change higher into our larger commercial dealings, as well as our retail trading? It would be one of both moral and economical advantage. But if it happens, moral force will have a share in bringing it about.

And in competition economic results of immense importance might be worked by moral forces. Competition is the very breath of our economic life; but, when it is morally reckless, it becomes economically hurtful too. Underselling, anyhow to the point of selling below cost price, to win a way into business or force competition out surely does much to bring about the insecurity of business, the frequency of failures, the oscillations of price, the overproduction, and other things of the kind from which our economical system suffers so much. There is room here for a higher standard of public opinion, and the forces which push up that standard, when we can trace them, are always the moral convictions of individuals.

But I told you I was going to end, and end I will. If I have made myself plain, I shall, however clumsily, have helped to clear a point of vital importance. No one, I hope, will think that I have said anything to underrate the scientific treatment of these subjects, or the value of the results given us by political economy. To plead that there is a place for conscience in these matters, is to say nothing against the place which the head and brain must claim. Morality is not merely sentiment and emotion: it is the work of our sense of right using all the light which truth of every kind can give. Ruinous indeed are the failures of those who try to touch economical matters with no equipment but that of a few moral principles—or, possibly, platitudes.

But with this caution, I may claim not to have exaggerated

what I had to say. In truth it might be fairly said that I had understated it. My title was, "Moral Threads in Social Webs." But I find in a thoughtful writer these words: "Commercial and industrial life is a moral fabric." It is true, perhaps, that, if we got to the heart of it, all the threads are moral. Think, for instance, how the whole work of trade is really a work of mutual human service, mutual human help. Of course it is self-help too. But each merchant, or shopman, or labourer, however keen he may be on making money, is working for the supply of public need. He is doing it, whether he recognizes it or not; and to recognize it will give his work a higher tone, and supply a key to principles which should influence its details. It is bad for any man to believe that he is engaged in merely selfish business. It is bad for him to think that there is no standard except gold or success by which to value the work which he takes up. It is bad for him not to see the noblest side of what he does.

And for us all it is bad to suppose that we live in a world of iron forces, with which we have little or nothing to do, except to be nimble in getting out of their way, or crafty in setting them to work for us. That higher part of man which we call spiritual or moral is depressed and cowed if it feels nothing but material and mechanical things all around it. Physical science is more and more breaking up the illusions of matter, making its "too too solid" substance "melt," till spirit which knows and feels and causes seems more real than it. And in the economical and social world we need to bring the warmth of moral conviction with us to the handling of its phenomena and its laws. Then we shall find more and more that what seems a cold relentless iron mechanism is really a framework which can glow red and white with moral heat, or, rather, is an organism of fixed, indeed, and ordered structure, and yet in all its parts the shrine and instrument of life.

E. S. TALBOT.

A DEFENCE AGAINST "SWEATING."

THE inquiry which Parliament instituted some years ago into the practice of "sweating" has taught us a good deal about the incidental features, the despicable little frauds and meannesses, the cruel extortions, associated with that, unhappily widely diffused, "form of competition." But it has scarcely helped us to a very precise comprehension of its essence and fundamental principles, and has certainly not brought us visibly nearer to the discovery of a remedy. Witnesses had very much to say about the oppressiveness and wickedness of the hateful practice; but when asked to state in words what "sweating" was, they found themselves driven to such vague generalities as this—that it consisted in "grinding the face of the poor"—a very scriptural phrase, but not one conveying any very precise practical meaning.

The inquiry would probably be simplified, and those who look for it might be better helped to the discovery of a remedy, if it were recognized that what in trade and industry we call "sweating" is at bottom little else than what in matters of credit we have long known as "Usury"—a rapacious abuse of the advantages secured by the command of money and a market, as against those who lack both, but are dependent upon them for their living. In practice, it must be admitted, "sweating" is even a little worse than usury, because there is less avoiding it; because it strikes at more helpless victims, with more enduring malignancy; and because it does not necessarily affix to its practitioners that open social stigma from which usury rarely escapes. It is not always easy to lift the curtain from off it. And to a large part of the public it is not quite easy to sympathize with its victims, except in that distant

and condescending way which cools down sympathy to a barren sense of pity.

If "sweating" is essentially identical with "usury," then, it is plain, legislative remedies can be of but little avail against it. Inspection, control, prohibition, penalties, all these have been tried against usury, and have proved fruitless. They touch only the surface, without going to the root of the evil, and altering the conditions which bring it forth, as bad soil brings forth weeds. On the other hand, the experience of co-operative credit institutions has shown, alike in Rhineland and in Italy, in Thuringia and in Switzerland, that against co-operation—placing borrowers to some extent on a par with lenders, giving them the cash which they require in a legitimate and easy way, instead of through the illegitimate and exacting channel of usury—the latter can nowhere stand. Testimony, official as well as private, is perfectly unanimous on this point. By the help of co-operative credit victims have been rescued from the very jaws of usury; the usurers' money-tables have been overthrown, and they themselves have been lashed out of their favourite hunting-grounds, where they found their occupation entirely gone. Any one who wishes to witness the process for himself, may do so by going into one of the countries named, where co-operative credit banks have been established and where their good work may be seen in active progress.

The experience naturally suggests the question: Could not the same remedy be turned to account against "sweating"?

That suggestion brings us face to face with a fresh problem. Co-operative credit, which kills usury, the world has had for more than forty years. But co-operative production—obviously the only form of co-operation which could prove of avail against "sweating"—is in its perfect shape still a discovery to come; at the present time it forms the standing *cruce* of co-operators. France has been trying to establish it for five and forty years, and, though it has done best in the matter among the nations of Europe, it can scarcely be said to have succeeded. One or two of its co-operative workshops have proved brilliant successes—as, for instance, the famous

Familistère of Guise, and the *Maison Leclaire*. There are others besides. But are they truly co-operative? M. Leroy Beaulieu, who has studied French co-operation like few besides, and who is, moreover, a zealous partisan of co-operative production, very reasonably objects—in agreement with many others—that in all this self-styled “co-operation” there is a large admixture of giving, of charity, and of an unequal division of responsibility and profit. Everywhere there is some kind capitalist benefactor standing at the back of the co-operative institution, taking all the risk, or providing the bulk of the money, or else, maybe, supplying the entire establishment ready-made, for co-operators to see what they can do with, upon the familiar principle, “Heads, we win; tails, you lose.” Mr. E. O. Greening, one of the keenest champions of co-operative production in this country, in his book, *The Co-operative Traveller Abroad*, puts the case, so to speak, in a nutshell. “How is it,” he asked in France, “that there are not more *Familistères*?” The significant reply was: “Because there are no more Godins.” With all its splendid merit, the *Familistère* is a hothouse plant, a product reared by artificial means, not by the workers themselves, but by a kind patron.

It is pretty much the same thing among ourselves. Our co-operative workshops are multiplying fast. Nobody ought to regret that. They help to arouse a more active interest in the worker, they make him a better workman, they secure him “the economy of better wages,” they educate him. But there are probably none wholly co-operative. There are none entirely the worker’s own creation. In most cases there is some human Providence, some good fairy standing behind, shielding, subsidizing, fostering the establishment which could not have grown up without such aid.

The explanation of this is, of course, to be found in the difficulty of finding the necessary capital and credit, which we have not yet in this country any means of providing, for what the late Sir R. Morier called “sinews and muscles” only. Skill, harmony, discipline, capacity for management, all these are to be found among the men themselves. But the want

remaining unsatisfied is the command of money—the worker's own money, that is; not somebody else's, supplied by generosity or philanthropy. Find that, place the worker in command of his own working capital, and the problem of co-operative production may be capable of solution. Schulze Delitzsch felt this when he described co-operative production as "the roof of the structure," and advised co-operators of all forms of co-operation to set hand to that last. First he advised them to build up credit. French co-operators, our masters in co-operative production, have felt the same thing all along. The "Father" of French co-operation, Buchez, at the very outset, when first introducing co-operative workshops, set up side by side with them, as a necessary complement, his well-intended but ill-fated *Crédit au Travail*. Gambetta was equally clear-sighted, but unfortunately equally unsuccessful, when he founded his *Caisse Centrale* for the same purpose. At the present day, leading French co-operators, like M. Leroy Beaulieu, lay it down that the *only* good purpose which co-operative credit can hope to serve is to provide funds for co-operative workshops.

Money, however, is, after all, to be had for co-operative production, free from any taint of demoralizing gift or profit-seeking loan, if you will but go the right way to work to secure it. Signor Luzzatti's *Banche Popolari* have, indeed, quite conclusively solved the problem. They have done so, really, beyond what might have been expected. Because, not only have they provided means of advancing money themselves to workmen, on the security of the latter's employment, but they have even taught private capital, once the safety of the process was made clear, to render the same service—willingly, readily, fearlessly. As late as a decade ago no capitalist in Italy would have looked at such security, any more than any capitalist would do so at the present time in this country. Now, it would surprise our men of money, as well as our working men, to see with what readiness capitalists advance large sums even to such poorly accredited associations as the *Società dei Braccianti*, bodies of navvies banded together to do common work. They have little

security to offer beyond their word and the very labour for which they require the loan. However, want of money never stands in the way of their acceptance of a contract, such as under the Baccarini Act they are permitted to receive even from the State for public works. For the *braccianti* themselves, and their brethren the *muratori*, this is a most convenient development. For, since they have turned avowedly socialist, they complain that the *banche popolari*, which are purely co-operative, make some bones of letting them have advances. In spite of that, with or without the help of co-operative banks, money is always forthcoming.

The organization of the Italian *società dei braccianti* and *dei muratori* is in itself a matter of considerable interest. They have become a recognized institution, an economic power in the land. In Budrio, Ravenna, and Milan they are particularly strong. In Milan they have executed large works—like the new cemetery wall which cost a million of lire, and the *torre potabile*, representing an even larger outlay—upon which I found them employed in October. But they are to be met with, more or less developed, all over Lombardy, Venetia, and Emilia. And in the Campagna they are prosecuting one of their most beneficial works, the reclamation and colonization of the marsh and waste land round Ostia, Camposalino, Maccarese and Isola Sacra, on which they are eventually to be settled as permanent occupiers. Thanks to the peculiar ability of their leader, Armando Armuzzi, this promises to prove one of the most successful settlements known.

Popular credit available for navvies and builders ought, as a matter of course, to be available also for other workers. As a matter of fact, it has in practice been found so, and in this shape it has proved a very effective remedy against "sweating." I am going to cite a particular practical instance, which ought to be of interest to English readers at a time when authorities like Mr. Schloss declare that "sweating" is among ourselves still as rife as ever, and when day after day we are constrained to admit that we have as yet discovered no effective remedy. For the enterprise here referred to was suggested by "sweating," and it

has beaten "sweating." It is distinctively a workmen's revolt against "sweating" masters, and it has resulted in a signal victory. It applies to a trade which, our own inquiry has shown, is peculiarly subject to the malpractice so much complained of; and in that trade to a particular form which favours "sweating" more than any other. Not a few of my countrymen, I should add, will probably ere long be in a position to judge for themselves of the success of the experiment. For it is to be presumed that the International Exhibition, for which the Italian Government is vigorously pushing on its preparations, will attract not a few English people to Milan. And, if they will but take the trouble to go a short distance outside the Porta di Volta, they will be able to see with their own eyes what the *Magazzini Generali del Mobilio*, purely co-operative institutions, have done for their members.

One of the staple trades upon which the working population of the neighbourhood of Milan largely rely for a living is cabinet-making, a trade to which the local population have always been partial, and which by preference they carry on, in accordance with long-established local custom, in their own homes, out in the country. In the villages all around you may see evidences of the trade—planks, boards, the raw material, the half-finished or the finished article—lying about, with gimlets and planes and other implements of joinery scattered among them. One cannot help being struck with the remarkable deftness in the use of knife and chisel which long practice has imparted to those rude fingers which at off-times handle, peasant-like, hoe and spade. There is exceedingly good work turned out in these cottage shops, but, as a matter of course, in each shop only work of one particular kind. The peasant cabinet-makers like the rather primitive organization of their manufacture, because it keeps them, while plying their trade, among their own families, where their wives and children may help them, in their own homes, and in the free country air; and because, on the whole, in their cottage homes, with fields by to provide corn and vegetables, they can manage to live more cheaply, in proportion to the comforts enjoyed, than they could if employed in a factory in

town. But that very organization makes them utterly dependent upon their employers, hands them over, in fact, bound hand and foot, to the tender mercies of a master, who in many cases is little better than a "sweater." The short prices which he allows constitute the smallest grievance complained of. There are deductions to boot, excuses for delay in payment, and exactions of "truck" purchases, against which the men are helpless.

Something like three years ago a number of joiners and cabinet hands resolved not to stand such treatment any longer. Co-operation was spreading in Italy, and for the first time becoming really known to artisans. Moreover, a sense of independence had infused itself into the workers generally, and had, more particularly in Milan, under the guidance of men like Gnocchi Viani and Giuseppe Croce, led to the formation of *leghe di resistenza*, fighting Trades Unions. The cabinet-makers refused to associate themselves with these militant bodies. They thought it a pity to waste valuable time over unprofitable fighting, when there was so much better work to be done. They decided simply to leave the "sweaters" alone, and set up shop for themselves. Shares taken up by the four hundred or so members, scattered over twenty-six villages, at £2 apiece, would provide a small fund for starting. Business would add to that. And meanwhile there was the *Banca Co-operativa Milanese*, one of the best-managed and most truly co-operative of Italian *banche popolari*, to advance them whatever they might require, not by way of favour, but as a matter of banking business, on the security of the goods which the men would make and their good faith. They set promptly about their work, and the beginning of May 1891 saw them installed in their own warehouse. Things were from the outset put upon a thorough business footing. Good work was insisted upon, and promptly paid for in cash. Every piece of goods entering the warehouse—most of it is done to order—is at once valued by experts. Of the value so ascertained the worker receives one-half down on the spot. The balance is paid not later than three months after sale. There is no "truck," there are no deductions. Even if there were no more than this, the *Magazzini* association would represent an appreciable gain

to its members. For even so, these receive more than they did before, and all in cash. But experience has disclosed a very substantial further benefit, in the return of more than 50 per cent. profit on the shares, which shows to what ringing metallic tune the cabinet-makers have heretofore been "sweated."

The assistance given by the *Banca Co-operativa* is by no means an act of patronage or of charity. It is pure business, just like the raising of money on his warehoused goods by a large manufacturer. The bank sees that it has its security. It takes a pledge for all the goods stored. It claims a right to inspect the warehouse at all hours, and to be informed what stock there is. It is also entitled to overhaul the books and ledgers, and satisfy itself in every respect as to its security.

With good will and capable management the *Magazzini Generali del Mobilio* soon succeeded in securing for themselves a good position in the market. Their goods, it was found, could be depended upon; and, notwithstanding the high profit earned for their members, they could manage to sell at moderate prices. In addition they offered private customers a share of their gains—20 per cent. of the net profits made. Dealers, of course, receive the usual discount. In 1892, the first full working year of the establishment, the *Magazzini* managed to sell 302,986 lire worth of goods, netting thereupon 16,650 lire of profit—that is, more than 50 per cent. upon the collective share capital, which then stood at 30,150 lire. A still better result was anticipated in 1893. When I was in Milan, in October, 277,741 lire worth of goods had already been sold, and the figure for the full year was expected to reach 400,000 lire. On the 277,741 lire worth already sold, a profit could be actually shown of 40,000 lire—that is, more than 100 per cent. on the total share capital, which had meanwhile grown to 39,600 lire. This success has not been purchased by any sacrifice of security. On the 1st of January, 1892, the reserve fund stood at only 405 lire. By last October it had risen to 8,812 lire, more than one-fifth of the share capital. The sales have increased to such an extent as to justify the opening of a shop in the City of Milan, and another in Cremona. The

Magazzini employ a traveller. They have for some time back sent some of their goods as far as England, and they hope to improve their connection with ourselves. As they can work cheaply and well, there is no reason why they should not do so. In truth, their progress has been very much smoother than any one could have anticipated. No doubt, as observed, good businesslike management stands for a great deal in this result. No private establishment could be better administered—which shows that good discipline and organization are perfectly consistent with industrial self-government. Every article coming in is carefully examined, and every precaution is taken to insure none but good work. Every worker is engaged upon his own particular speciality—chairs, tables, cabinets, whatever it be, of a particular type of pattern, though not necessarily precisely the same in every case. The finishing, polishing, gilding, lining, cushioning, fixing in mirrors, etc., are all done on the premises by a staff of members, steadily engaged for the work, and sharing in the benefit. The book-keeping is perfect. To prevent jealousy, every member has his own cypher with which his goods are marked, and of the meaning of which only the officers of the society are aware. In 1892, there were among 490 shareholder-members, 347 who contributed work. That means, as the Report points out:—347 little working men's households benefited, 347 artisans' families, comprising about a thousand workers, properly cared for, a thousand workers made their own masters, receiving regular work and regular pay, practically from themselves. And all this is done without cost to any one, with the help of only £2 laid down, paid up with more or less promptness, by every little household. Many members now own more shares than one; because they have discovered that there is no savings bank and no accessible investment which returns them so good an interest on their outlay. And all is so genuinely co-operative! There is no capitalist helping, or subsidizing, or taking over any responsibility whatever. The skill employed is such as working-men can provide, and is paid for according to the usual scale, which satisfies the superior employees. The whole concern is a little

republic, self-governing, self-supporting, what Signor Ettore Levi elsewhere calls "an honest and industrious family." I must confess that, in the course of a journey of economic inquiry, which took me from the Garonne eastward to the Valley of the Vistula, and southward to the banks of the Arno, I came across nothing which more keenly excited my interest.

Here are, it is true, on a small scale only, but none the less effectively and conclusively, two important economic problems successfully solved, which have hitherto defied solution: "sweating" has been vanquished; and production has been organized on an entirely co-operative basis. It would all have been impossible without the presence of a co-operative bank, versed in the valuation of the security which alone working men can give, willing to do business with them, *as business*, not as a matter of favour.

The experience ought to be not without its lesson to those who, in this country, aim at similar objects—the suppression of "sweating" and the establishment of production co-operative in the strictest sense. The last-named object (which helps to secure the former) is not, in the first instance, at any rate, to be accomplished with the help of capitalist money. A capitalist would come to the work either as a philanthropist and intending benefactor, which would introduce the demoralizing element of a gift, of dependence upon others, of an unequal division of risk, all of which are antagonistic to genuine co-operation; or else he would come to the enterprise as bent upon profit, and then he could scarcely long be fair to the workers so unequally yoked together with him in respect of security and credit. Although differing altogether with M. Leroy Beaulieu in respect of his thesis that assisting co-operative production is the *only* good work which co-operative credit banks can hope to accomplish, I seriously doubt if much genuine co-operative production is practicable in this country, as elsewhere, without the help of co-operative, that is, the borrowers' own, banks. The experiment shows what an efficient remedy co-operative production may prove to "sweating." And, if that were not enough to recommend it to notice in this much-"sweated" country, it

seems to suggest that, in its championship of its own interests, British "labour" may be neglecting one most useful weapon in favour of another that is getting slightly worn out. In England "labour" appears still, altogether in the combative stage of its existence. Like nations constituting themselves as great states, it has laid itself out for fighting, and by fighting has creditably secured for itself a respected and recognized position. Great nations, when they have done the same thing, as a rule lay the sword aside—though keeping it ready, to use if needed—in order to consolidate their position by cultivating profitable production. We have done so, to our profit; Germany is doing the same thing now; and, if France has not always adhered to the same useful principle, she has lost more than she has gained by her departure from it. Our Trades Unions have taught the Italians how to organize themselves in combative *leghe di resistenza*. It would scarcely be amiss if, in return, they were to learn from these industrious and pacific cabinet-makers of Lombardy, how to protect their own interests while actually adding to, and not diminishing, the stock of national production; how to meet illiberal employers, not by fighting, but by the more effective method of competition. There might be less excitement then, but there would also be less "clemming;" and, while the fight between employers and workers was fought out no less effectively, national production, the source of all labour, which has during recent years more than once appeared to be seriously endangered, to the loss of employment, would not be reduced, to the detriment of the labourers themselves.

HENRY W. WOLFF.

THREE MONTHS IN THE LONDON MILK TRADE.

NO one who has not been in search of a business can imagine the difficulty of finding one. Supposing, as in my case, that no very special inclination exists, it would seem a very easy matter to find something promising for either large or small capitalists. The papers teem with advertisements, the business agents have any number of businesses to sell, and yet, it does not matter much what kind or size of business you require, it is very difficult indeed to find a sound one. I was in partnership in an old-established business in London, and had the principal care of its management, but there were certain habits of long standing in it which, of late years, had not met with my approval. One of these was the habit of giving a certain discount on all transactions to the housekeepers or butlers. In our case no extra charge was made to the customer on this account, but the custom, of late, had not appeared to me quite as defensible as I at one time considered it. I also had a hankering after the system of one price to all comers for the same article. Some of my readers may be astonished to find that in many businesses the prices for the same article vary as much as the circumstances, the shrewdness, or the easy good nature of the customers. I believed that in this particular trade these matters might be altered, and business conducted nearly as profitably in a manner that met my entire approval. This and other considerations combined to induce me to look out for a change. I thought I had found one in my own trade, after long and weary searching, but, after having settled to dissolve my partnership, the vendor changed his mind. I was thus compelled to look around for something at once. After looking carefully into many businesses of various kinds, and not finding anything suitable, in an evil moment I was induced to

try the dairy trade. I went at once to three firms of dairy agents, and obtained all the information I could from them, and from any of my business friends who knew, or thought they knew, anything about the matter. I was told by nearly all that the business was a very pleasant, clean, and profitable one; that very little capital was actually required, but that it was unadvisable to commence without a good nucleus, and therefore that the best plan would be to purchase a moderate-sized business.

This I found somewhat difficult to do, as a condition with me was a roomy house capable of holding a very large "little" family. In the course of my inquiries I found that the goodwill paid for a milk business is not, as a rule, based upon any ordinary profit and loss account, but that a rough idea is formed of the profit from the number of barn gallons of milk sold *per diem*—a barn gallon equals eight quarts,—quite apart from butter, eggs, and other articles sold. I also found that there are at least three classes of milk trade—the threepence per quart, the fourpence per quart, and the fivepence per quart trade. Quite lately, however, the fivepenny trade has been nearly destroyed by the action of one of the large dairy companies.

I found that a great deal of money was made at times in the dairy trade by buying a small business, say twenty barns *per diem*, and another small business a little way off, perhaps another twenty barns, and working them together. After a time one shop would be closed, and both worked from the other centre. The value of each of these businesses separately would be roughly about £15 to £20 per barn, or from £300 to £400 for the goodwill. But the ratio value per barn gallon increases as the number sold *per diem* increases, consequently the value of the two combined, instead of being twice the one, or from £600 to £800, would be at the rate of about £30 per barn, or $£30 \times 40 = £1200$. This increases still more if the number of barns sold at one single establishment increases to about eighty or one hundred barns a day. I was informed by one of the most respectable agents in London that he had actually sold, within the last year, a West-End dairy selling about a hundred

barns, or eight hundred quarts, of milk *per diem*, for the sum of £100 per barn gallon or £10,000 (these are rough figures), the goodwill of each quart being thus equal to £12 10s.—the value of the quart being only fivepence or, at the outside, sixpence. It is thus evident that, in this instance, the retailer would have to supply a customer with milk for a thousand days before he received back the sum paid for goodwill, assuming the half to be profit, which it certainly is *not*, even at the above extravagant prices. The goodwill paid at £20 per barn gallon or £2 10s. per quart of milk sold for fourpence to fivepence would not be repaid, assuming the half of the price of fourpence to fivepence to be profit, until he had supplied each quart of milk about 266 days. And so the scale varies according to the size of the business.

I mention these facts because I found, afterwards, that these high prices, paid for the privilege of supplying one of the chief necessities of life, are the leading and primary cause of the lying, adulteration, and deception apparently so universal in the London milk trade.

To return to my story, I found at last a moderate-sized business, about four miles from London, in a pretty suburb, but not a very aristocratic one, so that I fondly hoped that the system of tips, discounts, and bribes would not be in vogue. I was fortunate enough to meet in the vendor of the business a man who was apparently honest and straightforward—at least, I made several careful inquiries in the neighbourhood and found such to be his reputation. I also found that he constantly asserted that he never did anything in business of which he was ashamed. I ascertained that he worked very hard, and that his reason for selling was a growing infirmity of deafness which greatly hindered him in his business. He and his wife and family, I found, were regular attendants at one or other of the places of worship near at hand. I need hardly say that, before deciding upon this business, I consulted several friends, and laid the facts before them as well as I could. I also had a kind friend who offered to lend me capital on easy terms, wherewith to increase my business.

All seemed fair, the house was a nice one, the neighbourhood healthy and growing fast in population, and no opposition dairy within one-third of a mile. I signed the agreement and paid a deposit, and then my real experience of the dairy trade began. A wiser man than I am would probably have forfeited his hundred pounds deposit, and have turned tail and fled. But, believing the public only wanted fair dealing and straightforward conduct, I resolved to stand by my guns. I found, first, that all milk has to be "dyed" to suit the London fancy. This is effected by mixing about one tea-spoonful of liquid "anatto," a vegetable dye of a harmless nature, with every eight quarts of milk. I did not like this habit at all; it savoured of trickery and deception, for the customers had no idea that it was done. I am not sure if it is against the Adulteration Act or not, but it is universally practised in London. I then found my pious friend the vendor was in the habit of mixing margarine and butter to sell as "cooking butter," a habit that prevails largely in the connection trade, though it does not pay when much butter is sold for cash, as detection is more easy. I found that some customers required what is termed "nursery milk." This "nursery milk" is supposed to come from some special cow kept for the purpose of supplying infants or invalids. The habit is to send it in a special can—either sealed, locked, or labelled before leaving the dairy,—and to pay for the extra trouble an extra penny per quart is charged. My milk being nearly all country milk—*i.e.* the whole of my milk being bought through wholesale milkmen, and coming from various parts of the country by rail,—I was quite unable to see how I should manage to supply "nursery milk;" but I was told that it was easy enough, one had only to put the ordinary milk in a separate can, and it became "nursery milk" by a kind of mysterious transformation. One customer had complained that the "nursery milk" did not agree with baby, so a tea-spoonful of lime-water was considerably added, the pious milk purveyor thus assuming the character of an unknown benevolent physician, free, gratis for nothing,—or rather, I should say, for one penny the quart.

The next information was that, it being winter time, new-laid eggs were almost impossible to get, but were in great demand, and fetched a good price, twopence and twopence-halfpenny each. The plan adopted to meet this demand was as follows. A case (1200) of French or other foreign eggs was purchased at about a penny each. The top layer generally contained a large number of large cream or dark-coloured eggs. These had doubtless been packed or laid in the case last, and, therefore, became "new-laid." The next largest and less creamy were the "best fresh" or "warranted" "best breakfast eggs;" and the smaller eggs made their first appearance in the dairy as "fresh," at ten for a shilling. After a few days the "new-laid" (in a well-regulated establishment) became the "best fresh," the "best fresh" became "fresh," and the "fresh" became pudding eggs at a penny each. But my pious friend found this process rather tedious, so his "new-laid" remained "new-laid" until the next case was opened, and then the new "new-laid" were placed with the old "new-laid" and sold in a mixed condition, and the other qualities shared a like fate.

My pious friend never "watered" his milk—at least, I never saw him do so. It was rather remarkable, however, that more milk was occasionally sold than ever was bought, but that was, perhaps, some error in booking up—a process that I found, afterwards, sometimes assumes the guise of "cooking up." The cans were washed, too (this I found out afterwards), in a copper where the family linen was occasionally boiled. They were brushed with a spoke-brush which was used to wash the cart with, and, after cleaning, they were hung in the stable to dry, so as to be handy for the morning: this made them, no doubt, very sweet! These last are not the tricks of the trade, but the peculiarities of my pious friend. Each man has his own idiosyncrasies, and some milkmen, in their desire to guard their dairy, to keep it clean and wholesome, etc., are known to sleep under or upon the counter. I found this dairy had been worked very carelessly and dirtily. "All the better for me," I thought; "if this man, who is so careless and unbusinesslike in some matters, can do so much, how much more shall I do when I

improve things?" I resolved that my ideas of fair and straightforward dealing should come into practice now I was my own master, and I started as I meant to go on. No dyeing the milk! But that, alas! was soon altered; my customers would have none of it. In vain I explained to them that the proper colour of most milk is white. They insisted that my white milk was "chalk and water," and that other people's "cream-coloured" milk was creamy milk—beautiful, rich, fresh milk. My milk was skimmed, etc. I gave way in this thing alone; I gave them their hearts' desire, the cream-coloured milk. Some few knew better, and were glad to get the milk as they had seen it in the country. I ceased to sell "cooking" butter made up of margarine, etc.; but I sold margarine to meet my customers' requirements: and here I was more successful—the matter was better understood. As to eggs, I declined selling French as "new-laid," and bought new-laid country eggs at a penny three-farthings each, selling them at twopence and twopence-halfpenny. This gave satisfaction to some; but the sale was not very certain, and many remained over to be sold at a penny-halfpenny, being no longer "new-laid." This, I need not say, did not pay; but with this plan I persevered to the end. I could not sell eggs for a penny which cost me a penny, give credit, and send them home and risk breakages. Consequently, I lost several egg customers. It is usual to do things in the way I described before, and the public don't and won't understand these things, or trouble about them. With butter, again, I did not like selling the same butter for two prices, and my plans for honest dealing in butter cost me more customers than I gained. Then when I told people I did not keep "nursery milk," the fat was in the fire indeed. "Every other dairy does; why do not you?" Certainly two or three customers believed me, because they knew something of the matter; and, to meet their views, I arranged to obtain a little milk from a private establishment near, where a gentleman had a little more than was needed for his own household. For this I had to pay a little extra—threepence per quart. I have not yet said that an average price for country milk is

twopence-halfpenny per quart in winter, and twopence-farthing in summer, "wholesale."

For a short time, being naturally an early riser, I determined to employ carriers only, and to be my own foreman. I accordingly rose at five o'clock every morning, and measured my milk when it came in, and measured it out to the men to take out—each man accounting for his share at the close of the day. I fitted up a proper dairy, the milk having previously been measured in the shop. This I found (by some peculiarity of the law) constituted the place a milk-shop and not a "dairy," and the inspector pays much less attention to the cleanliness of the back premises of the former. I had the cleaning-house put in proper order, and the cans were no longer cleaned in a copper in which soiled linen was boiled, or brushed with the spoke-brush, or hung in the stables to drain. All this involved, together with alteration of drains, considerable expense; and "No doubt amply paid you," says the reader. Not a bit of it. Customers had never asked to inspect the back premises, and, although informed great improvements had been made, they were mostly sceptical and indifferent. One customer, when I was in the thick of the alterations, quite upset me. She had some dear children, she said, and could not afford to run risks, and, knowing my dear pious predecessor had been so very clean, she had dealt with him, but she could not continue with me, as she did not know me. I pointed out the state of things, but, alas! we know how hard it is to convince a woman against her will.

The hours in this business had been very long, customers coming quite late in the evening—somewhat to my surprise, as it was a neighbourhood of respectable villa residents; but they would run out of milk, and want eggs, syphons of soda, packet tea, or butter quite up to eleven o'clock, though I managed to reduce this to ten after a time. Then on Sunday they would come at all hours, and knock at the private door if the shop was shut. On Christmas Day we were continually disturbed—I shall not forget my Christmas in the milk trade as long as I live. Of course every Sunday, bank holiday, etc., we had to work till midday at least. Well, I got knocked up—not ill, but unable

to keep on at foreman's work, and make out books, and manage everything; so, after three or four weeks, I engaged a competent foreman at about thirty shillings per week, with whom I had a first-rate character. I did not regret this step, but it only opened my eyes more widely to the tricks of the trade. Allowance being made for his past training and experience, my foreman was a kind, well-meaning, straightforward fellow, but quite prepared to see no harm in the tricks of the trade, of which he showed me a few more. By this time I had become acquainted with several other dairymen, and with the travellers of various wholesale houses in the provision trade. I found that my scruples were laughed at, that the tricks mentioned were considered quite justifiable. Indeed, in many instances the theory was advanced that it was all the fault of the public, who were unreasonable in their demands, and of the regulations, which were impracticable and unjust to the trade. I must say that, to some extent, their views appear reasonable to me. I have not yet told how the milk is watered by many, and yet how discovery is impossible. There is an instrument called a "lactometer." By this we can tell to some extent whether or no water has been added to milk. But there is a point where it is impossible, even for an analyst, to say if the milk is naturally poor milk, or milk with water added to it. The law allows a reasonable margin, and the trade takes the full advantage of this margin. Therefore, when the milk sent up from the country is rich with cream, this is very often skimmed, and the skimmed milk mixed with unskimmed, thus reducing the richness of the milk, but in such proportions that it cannot absolutely be ascertained. There is another method of adding water to milk, viz. pouring down the cow's mouth. Feed your cows on low diet, and you will produce poor milk without adding water to it. I never allowed this trick of adding water, but I was in continual dread of its being added by the men on the rounds, who, having several customers who paid cash, were able to increase the quantity by this means, and put the money in their own pockets. I several times suspected this, but was not able to satisfactorily prove it. The law is very unfair in this

case, as the master is fined and no pains are taken to discover whether or no the milk has been tampered with at the dairy itself. It is, doubtless, very difficult to discover whether the master or the man is guilty; but it means such a serious loss to a master, who may be perfectly honest, that I consider some plan should be tried. If a master had to leave with the milk inspector a complete list of the streets on each round, the inspector could on the same morning test the milk on each round by taking a sample from each man, and he could also get one from the dairy itself. If they were all watered, it might fairly be considered to be the fault of the dairy-keeper, or his wholesale house, which he should keep in order himself. If one round only was tampered with, the inspector might leave the matter a week or two, and make successive visits; in time he would no doubt bring home the guilt to the right individual. One of the greatest troubles to a dairyman trying to act honestly and straightforwardly is the unscrupulous conduct of those responsible for the management of some of the large dairy companies. Many of these profess to sell milk fresh from cows kept near at hand. The public have no idea of the size of a business, nor of the quantity of milk yielded on an average by each cow. If they trouble at all to inspect a dairy farm, they find everything on a model footing, and go away satisfied. Should they suggest that there do not seem many cows for such a large business, they are promptly informed that there are several other establishments of a like nature in many districts. These little model dairy farms are kept up for show purposes only; and, in the case of one large company, I believe only about five per cent. of the milk supplied comes from their own cows—the rest being purchased from the farmers by contract, and coming up by rail. It may be thought that this five per cent. is used for nursery and invalid's milk. This is not so: I have it on the authority of a very large milk contractor that he does not know any one in the trade who makes a rule of distinguishing between invalid's or nursery milk and the ordinary milk, except in theory—in practice it is one and the same. There is no harm in country milk; on the contrary, I firmly believe it to be the

best, as the cows live more natural lives, are not confined to so small a space, and have more nourishing grass: but, the harm comes in when it is sold for milk just fresh from the cow.

The gullibility of the public is marvellous when a big company is concerned in a fraud. The managers of the large companies often start for themselves, and introduce their habits of lying wholesale to the trade in general. My foreman had been in charge of a fairly large business at one time, and, finding that I had been trying my hand at canvassing, he asked me what I said when requested to state where I kept my cows. I replied that I told people I had my milk up from the country, and did not keep my own cows. "Oh, that will never do, sir!" he said; "you will never get a customer that way." "Well, what do you do," I said, "when your employer for the time keeps *no* cows at all? I know, if he kept a few, you would tell the customer the dairy-farm for *their* neighbourhood was where the said few were kept." "Oh, it does not matter whether he keeps cows or not, as I can always imagine a dairy farm, and give a description of it—and I generally place it in a direction some little distance from the customer's house, and awkward to get at; and I have never known of an instance when they tried to find it, and prove my words, and I have thus got hundreds of customers."

I was told by him, and by several wholesale people, that I should never succeed near London, as a dairyman, if I did not tell lies. I soon saw that it would be a very long fight, and, if successful at last, it would only be to a limited extent, and at the expense of a lifelong worry and anxiety. The business I had bought was not large enough to keep my family, and I had intended to add another to it with the borrowed capital, but I felt it would be tempting Providence to go on in such a business; so I determined to sell as soon as possible, and try to find some business which was capable of being carried on more easily on an honest basis.

My attempts at canvassing must now be described. I am generally considered a rather good hand at canvassing, but canvassing in the milk trade is unique. As a rule the public do

not change their milkman very often, unless they are moving. Therefore the canvassing is directed to those who are about to move in, and no pains are spared to get the name and address of the tenant who has just taken a house, but not moved. It is seldom much use to wait until he has moved, as some enterprising tradesman has found out whence he comes and written or sent to see if he can get the trade. This leads to either bribing the house agent's clerk for the name and address as soon as each house is taken, or the house agent himself makes a business of it, and charges you a fixed sum of 2s. 6d. or 5s. for each name and address furnished. As soon as you get the name and address, you call on the individual moving, and great judgment must be used as to the best time to call. No expense must be spared as regards distance. I know one firm that sends even to Paris; but a hundred miles is a common distance to send to try and get a really good customer, though of course there are a large number at a short distance. I certainly succeeded occasionally in obtaining a customer, but the removals from my own connection more than neutralized the good effect. I found truth powerless in the majority of instances. I was simply not believed when I explained some tricks of the trade—it was I who was playing on their credulity. I was reminded of the story of Ahab and the lying prophets; people believed what was pleasant to them. It was pleasant to think they were going to live within a short distance of a beautiful dairy farm, and have all their milk fresh, etc., and, as they had been told the same thing before, they believed it. I found that the caretakers of empty houses have great influence in recommending new comers; they are accordingly treated with great respect by the trade, and are frequently supplied with milk gratis during the time they occupy them. One caretaker told me that a firm in my neighbourhood had supplied her with a pint of milk free for over six months. Whether the baker or butcher, etc., does the same thing I do not know, but I expect something of the sort is done. I never can understand why the public as a whole do not judge for themselves in these matters, and steadily refuse to be canvassed or cajoled into dealing with people about whom they

have learnt nothing. A dairyman told me that he gave a caretaker thirty shillings to obtain him a customer having a quart of milk daily; another dairyman had offered her twenty shillings but was outbid. It is evident that these expenses cannot be obtained from the really fair gains of the trade. I asked a wholesale vendor of milk, and a dairyman's agent, how this sort of thing paid. He told me that, in many instances, it was made to pay by systematically booking more than the quantity of milk delivered to customers. In one business in the West End it was quite a usual thing for some customers to be charged six or eight quarts daily, when only four to six were sent, and many other ways of overcharging could be discovered. Only get the customer on the books, and some means would be found to make him pay.

The greatest evil in dealing with these matters is the general indifference. People take it to be a matter of absolute necessity that these tricks of trade should be, and they will not take the trouble to look into things for themselves; how, then, can they help the honest, or discourage the dishonest tradesman? In a war of wits the specialist is bound to win; but I believe many tradesmen would gladly give up these practices, if the giving up did not involve giving up their living. I have not yet mentioned that some people actually dye eggs, as the public prefer creamy and dark eggs, thinking them more like new-laid. Butter and cheese most people know to be coloured with anatto.

At last I found an opening in the business I had been in so long, and, though a very poor one, I determined to sell out of the milk trade, and venture. Having to sell rather hurriedly, I had to make a sacrifice; and, having paid a full price for the business on account of the house, I lost about half my little capital in the three months. This loss would not have been so great under ordinary circumstances, or if I had been in the position to wait longer for a purchaser.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE CHARITY ORGANIZATION SOCIETY.

THE precepts of Christianity seem opposed to those of wise charity. Christ said, "Give to him that asketh." They who are most experienced in methods of relief say, "Give nothing without inquiry. Indiscriminate charity is cruel." Christ said, "Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth." They who are most familiar with the poor say, "Co-operate together; compare notes; overlapping of gifts is wasteful, and provokes deceit." This opposition between the words of Christ and the wisdom of our time is the source of much anxiety. People do violence to themselves if they disobey their Lord. They do mischief to the poor if they disobey the teaching of experience.

The mistake at the bottom of the difficulty is very old. There is always a tendency to exalt the letter above the spirit. People made so much of the words of the second command, that Ezekiel said, "Ye shall no more say, The sins of the fathers shall be visited on the children." They took up Isaiah's word "burden," till Jeremiah said, "Ye shall no longer talk of burden." The Pharisees who honoured the letter of the law killed Him who came to fulfil the law. There are many now who honour their Lord's words, regarding them as sacred, while they miss His spirit.

It is not for us to ask what the Lord said, so that our charity may follow the letter of words which nineteen hundred years ago directed the charity of the simple life of Palestine. It is for us to listen to His words, that we may learn His spirit and do His will, as we try to help the poor in the complex life of the nineteenth century.

1. Christ's spirit is the spirit of thoroughness. Christian charity should be thorough. Our Lord did nothing by halves. He had few friends, but He bound each to Himself by cords of daily service. He thought of each, and met the need before it was asked. He healed few—only one out of the crowd of Bethesda—but He made them whole. He gave His best to the casual stranger, and did not leave the woman He met at the well till she went away saying, "Come, see a Man who told me all things that ever I did." He did not give a dole of talk—drop a text and pass on. He gave everything—home, reputation, and life—and by one sacrifice of Himself, once offered, saved the world. The spirit of Christ, which breathes through the often-quoted words, "If any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go one mile, go with him twain. Give to him that asketh, and him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away from," is the spirit of thoroughness.

Christ's spirit requires that Christian charity should be thorough; it condemns the insufficient dole, the gift which only half cures, the help which goes only half-way. It says, "Leave alone what you cannot do; do well what you can."

Our Lord lays down a principle, but He expresses this principle in detail, and gives specimens of the acts required. He does this to show us that we too must express the principle in acts fitted to our time. It will not do to be, as people say, "thorough in spirit." We must show thoroughness by the way we give and help. We must use all our thought on one poor person, discover all his needs, and spend all our powers on meeting them. We must save shillings and give pounds.

2. Christ's spirit considers others' needs. Christian charity should consider others' needs. Our Lord's enemies said of Him, "He saved others; Himself He cannot save." He had no thought for Himself, no longing for men's gratitude or praise. He had no thought either for His own methods, His party, or His system. Others' needs were before any rights. "Forbid him not," He said of one who, going another way, was doing good. "Let both grow together," was the conclusion of one of His

parables. "Any way Christ is preached," was St. Paul's remark on hearing of others' heresies.

The spirit of Christ breaks up the claims made by self, by parties, and by sects. No rights and no claims must stand in the way of others' needs.

Christian charity must yield to this spirit. It must not say, "For the sake of my own soul I will hide my gift;" "For the sake of my party I will not let others interfere;" "For the sake of the traditions of the trust, I as trustee cannot depart from old ways." Christian charity, putting others' needs first, must co-operate with all who are ready to help. The private giver must at this call give up his love of privacy; churchman and chapelman must work together; the trustee and the reformer must co-operate.

3. Christ's spirit regards the future. Christian charity should regard the future. Our Lord saw men as they desired to be. He saw beyond the children their angels in heaven. He found in men a faith which transfigured the lowest. He addressed their real selves, and awoke them to live a new life. The man among the tombs, whom his fellows had bound with chains, heard the call, and went home, a new man, to his friends. Our Lord fixed His eyes on the coming kingdom, and fed men with the living words which would fit them to be its citizens. He saw in them the character which would abide when the form perished, and He set Himself to raise character. He saved men's bodies to raise their souls.

The spirit of Christ puts character in the first place. "To what purpose shall a man gain the whole world, if he lose his own soul?"

Christian charity must also regard character. It must use its gifts to bring out independence, trust, and truth. It must not, just to satisfy a poor man's passing need, encourage habits of idleness or deceit. It must not say of the poor, "They are happy," and pass on justified. It must not by a gift make a momentary peace, and leave the seeds of a crop of envy, hatred, and uncharitableness. The saying, "I have done a good deal; if I have been cheated, that's the receiver's loss," is not in

Christ's spirit. Christian charity must take thought of the future, and in Christ's spirit give the bread, not of a moment, but of life.

Thoroughness, consideration of others' needs, and regard for the future, are some of the principles of Christian charity.

Thoroughness, which implies inquiry and investigation ; consideration for others, which implies co-operation ; regard for the future, which implies respect for character, are also some of the principles of the Charity Organization Society, which are "to help the poor rightly, to help them thoroughly, and always to help them, that they may either maintain or regain their self-respect."

Practice and principles are, alas ! not always identical. They who are most devoted to the Charity Organization Society will confess that its practice is sometimes below its principles. The thoroughness with which they inquire into causes has not always been undertaken in Christ's spirit of tenderness. Human beings are too often regarded as "cases," and memories are touched with so rough a hand that the relief fails to heal the wound. That consideration for others' needs which makes them ask for co-operation has not always been free of pride. They have inclined to think certain methods of relief infallible, and they have not had our Lord's sympathy with the good intentions of those who seem foolish. They have condemned isolation where they might have won co-operation. Lastly, their respect for character has often regarded only one side of the man ; they have aimed to develop his independence and thrift, and they have not made him generous and trustful. The relieved beggar went from Christ's presence saying, "I will follow Thee wherever Thou goest." The relieved beggar leaves the Charity Organization Society office saying, "I will be thrifty, however my neighbours suffer." Independence and thrift are essential parts of character, but so also are generosity and trust.

The principles of the Charity Organization Society are the principles of the Christian spirit. If the practice sometimes falls short, it is yet a great matter to have among us a Society which to-day represents the high Christian ideal. That it does fall short is, indeed, the fault of those who, believing in Christ, do

not become members of the Society. That it does rise high among the agencies of the time must be obvious to those who, confused by the modern perplexities, are asking, "What would my Lord have me to do for the poor?" This Society helps to interpret Christ to our day.

Its advantage must also be obvious to those who contemplate the charities of our great cities. Charities are often the measure of a city's demoralization. The chance of gifts from old trusts; the overlapping of relief from voluntary and poor-law agencies; the sight of successful begging or deceit, weaken the very sources of a city's strength, and drive some citizens to wish the abolition of all charities.

Alongside, however, of the loss of money and of the greater loss of moral fibre caused by misgiven charity, is the great mass of those whom rightly given charity could help. This Society would bring together all who care for the poor—guardians, trustees, and private givers. It would, by co-operation, prevent overlapping of relief; it would make impossible deceit or disappointment; it would unite good will, human feeling, generosity, and Christian emotion, and bring them to bear, by personal service, on personal needs.

The Charity Organization Society puts into force the Christian spirit, and faces a great social danger. It waits only for more power.

Men are thinking of Christ in relation to their social duties. They must not take His words as the Pharisees took Moses' words, as people always take the words of the great. They must not bind themselves as slaves to the letter which killeth, but yield themselves to the spirit, whose service is freedom.

Our Lord helped His neighbour—the man by His side who was in need. He helped him, grudging nothing; and He helped him thoroughly. He was the good Shepherd who, through storm and hardship, through buffets and failures, went after the one sheep that was lost; who, when He found it, took it tenderly in His arms and *never* let it go. Let those who would be charitable to-day see that they so help others as generously, as persistently, as thoroughly, as tenderly.

Our Lord cared for others, guiding every word and every act to their service. He, forgetting Himself, felt their needs. He saw into the agony of the sick man's soul, and forgave him his sins. He felt His Mother's loneliness, and gave her a son to take her to his home. He understood the Pharisees, and helped them by stern, hard rebuke. He cherished in each the character God had planted, and had one treatment for the impetuous Peter, another for busy Martha, and another for the thoughtful Mary. He served all according to their needs, as in God's light He saw those needs. Let those who would help to-day see that they so serve others with such sympathy, with such sacrifice, with such hope.

From our Lord's presence men will then turn to consider this Society, which wants more power to do great and needed work. They will recognize its strength and its weakness, its possibilities and its shortcomings, and they will then, I hope, as its members, add to it a large measure of Christ's spirit.

S. A. BARNETT.

THE PROPOSED INDUSTRIAL UNION OF EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYED: AN EMPLOYER'S VIEW.

THE recent Coal War has called the attention of the whole community to the Labour Question. The interests involved were enormous. It has been stated that nearly 1,000,000 men were rendered idle for three months, that £250,000,000 of capital earned no interest during that period, and that the direct loss to the nation cannot be estimated to have been less than £30,000,000.¹ The leader of one of the contending forces summed up his opinion as to the results of the strife in the honourably candid statement—"Both sides got a good licking."² This colossal conflict—with such dubious issues—is but symptomatic of the terribly unsettled state of our present industrial system. These considerations may well make patriotic men willing to take trouble, and to run the risk, if need be, of misrepresentation, in the endeavour to contribute to the fruitful discussion of this most difficult, yet urgent problem.

During the last month or two several employers, located in different parts of the Midlands, have felt a desire for an opportunity of conferring with one another on the present industrial situation. This desire was mentioned to several representative working men, and they at once agreed that it would be desirable for workmen to make a simultaneous approach to their fellows with the object of arranging ultimately for a joint conference of employers and employed. Eventually, twenty employers and twenty workpeople, representing some of the chief trades and some of the principal industrial centres, were asked to meet in London on March 16th.

¹ "The Coal Dispute of 1893," by C. M. Percy, *Economic Journal*, December, 1893.

² Presidential address by Mr. B. Pickard, M.P., at the Annual Conference of the Miners' Federation.

In making the selection, regard has been paid to the existence of representative bodies of employers and workmen, although it has not been thought desirable to ask the chief Employers' Associations and Trade-unions to delegate members: the first essential for the success of such a meeting is, naturally, that the members should belong to the conciliatory wings of their respective organizations.¹

The further question naturally suggested itself as to whether it would be desirable to attempt the formation of an influential Joint Association of employers and employed. In the face of the thousand and one societies already existing in England, the mere suggestion of an additional one may be regarded as a bold thing. But, at the present time, there is no association through the agency of which those employers and workmen who are alive to progressive and humane industrial ideas may keep in touch with one another for the purposes of mutual encouragement, educative work, and concerted action when occasion may rise. There were many societies in existence at the time of the establishment of the Anti-Corn Law League; and, although the cases are not quite parallel, the loss and suffering to-day through the present industrial feuds can hardly be considered less serious than those which accompanied the old Corn Laws.

It seems clear to the promoters that there is an opening for an association which—while adopting as a fundamental principle the recognition of association and combination, whether between workmen or between employers—would emphasize the underlying common interests of both classes, and which would endeavour to arouse and to cultivate the feeling of good-will on both sides. There is no platform for the deliberate and regular setting forth of industrial ideas and methods which individual employers or workmen may have found valuable in their own spheres. Supposing that an employer has discovered

¹ A full report of the proceedings of this Conference can be obtained from Mr. Edwin Rainbow, The Butts, Coventry (Secretary *pro tem.* to the Provisional Committee). The *Daily News* (March 17th) thus concludes its account of the meeting: "The proceedings were marked by complete unanimity, and were characterized throughout by a spirit of earnestness and hopefulness."

that an eight-hours day is good for himself and for his workmen, how is he to communicate that information to the public? If he states the fact at a public meeting, he will probably be credited with motives of vulgar ambition in connection with some public office. If he sends a contribution to an ordinary journal, he runs the risk of appearing to advertise himself by parading his sagacity or benevolence. Business men generally are sensitive on these points, and probably the slowness of our industrial development in a humane direction is in a certain degree due to these considerations.

As a concession to the prejudices already existing in business circles, it would perhaps be desirable to limit the "membership" to "practical" people, whether employers or employed. But it would be most desirable to obtain the sympathy and co-operation of public teachers and social authorities, by enlisting them, if possible, as "associates." The minimum subscription should be of such an amount as could be paid without difficulty by the average working man. Arrangements might also advantageously be made for the collective membership of trade societies.

Such a society would not primarily concern itself with the settlement of specific labour disputes. Its object would be to encourage and foster feelings which would remove, in many cases, the grounds for such disputes. The society would have scope for needed educative influence in many ways. If only the directors could secure and retain the full confidence of both sides—and the reports of the evidence given before the Labour Commission show how considerable is the common basis of sympathy already existing—its pronouncements upon such subjects would have a quite exceptional force. With its store of sifted facts and well-weighed theories, such a society might even be serviceable to the Government in the preparation of industrial legislation.

An association on the suggested lines would not propose any violent and sudden change in the industrial system. It would, first of all, address itself to industry as it is. Care would be taken to avoid giving to the outsider any "faddist" or sectional impression. Obviously there is scope for stimulating better

feeling between employers and employed. The Association would enable those employers and workmen who are characterized by feelings of open-eyed trust to strengthen their forces by union, so that they might do their best to educate out of existence as many as possible of those employers and workmen who entertain feelings of mutual distrust.

But besides endeavours in this broad field, there are certain definite subjects which many practical employers consider ripe for careful and dispassionate discussion. The following subjects are mentioned for the sake of definiteness; but employers, by joining the Association, would not be expected to commit themselves to any special opinions on any of them :—

Length of Working Day.

Irregularity of Employment.

Employment of Married Women.

Sanitary Conditions for Working.

Profit-Sharing.

International Industrial Relations.

A useful purpose would be served by making known among the members, and among social authorities and press editors, by a Monthly Journal and otherwise, the results of experiments in connection with the above and similar industrial developments. Three of these subjects may be enlarged upon for the sake of illustration :—

As to the Length of the Working Day. The action of the present Government in introducing the eight-hours day for 20,000 employees under the War Department will certainly give an impetus to the movement for reducing working hours. It is noteworthy that the minister for the department in question expressed his opinion, based upon careful experiments and inquiries, that this large reduction of hours will be made “with advantage both to the public service and to the men employed.”¹ Employers will naturally want to know whether the conditions of their respective businesses are such as to allow of the eight-hours day with similar economic results. In the proposed Journal, the names and the trades of the chief firms making this

¹ Daily papers, January 6, 1894.

change, and also reports of the results of such experiments, might appear from month to month. Where one business man is affected by abstract argument, a hundred will be affected by successful experiment.

As to Profit-Sharing. In spite of an increasing literature on this subject, radical and widespread misunderstandings still prevail as to the practical operation of the system. For one thing, it is commonly assumed that, under profit-sharing, a portion of the "extra profits" resulting from the stimulus of the system must go to the employer.¹ The concession is ignored which is made as a rule by a firm when profit-sharing is introduced.² In many cases, it will be possible, and in some cases it will be certain, that all the "extra profits" will go to the workpeople. The editor of an industrial journal would be able to make clear such a point, which, for obvious reasons, cannot well be urged by the employers in question.

Another mistaken notion is that profit-sharing must necessarily be an unfair rival of trade-unionism. As a matter of fact, many—probably the majority of—profit-sharing employers recognize in trade-unionism a desirable institution for maintaining a general standard wage.³ In ideal forms, in fact, the two systems may be regarded as—

"Twins, a sister and a brother,
Each the dearer for the other."

It must, however, be admitted that there is some force in the argument that profit-sharing by itself may tend to sectionalize and to render selfish the participating workers. In this connection it will be seen that the proposed Association would furnish a desirable complement to profit-sharing. In the case of many profit-sharing firms a certain number of the employees

¹ Cf. the hostile criticism on "Profit-Sharing and the Labour Question" in the *Daily Chronicle* of March 31, 1893.

² In the *Appendix of the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Royal Commission on Labour, sitting as a Whole*, p. 210, there is a memorandum by the present writer, showing that, with 90 per cent. of a representative number of cases, some concession was made at the outset.

³ Some profit-sharing employers go so far as to prescribe, as one of the conditions for participation, membership in the trade-union.

would be likely to join such an association, and would be brought into sympathetic relations with large numbers of workmen in all parts of the country; thus, to a certain extent, the point would be taken off this not unnatural trade-unionist objection.¹

As to International Industrial Relations. This heading may serve to indicate the opportunity that would be afforded to workmen for obtaining a better knowledge of the difficulties attending foreign competition, and the dangers of unduly raising the cost of production; and to employers, of the advantages to industry which a good rate of wages affords, as being (among other things) a stimulus to the discovery of improved industrial methods.

As to the best *modus operandi* for the proposed Society, experience would, no doubt, suggest the most effective ways of working. Two desirable features should, however, be here briefly indicated.

Local Branches of the Union might with advantage be gradually set up in the chief industrial and agricultural centres, each worked by a double Committee, consisting of an equal number of employers and employed. Such branches should exercise a valuable, permeating influence in the direction of fostering good feeling and preventing disputes. The conditions of a trade can only be fully apprehended by those resident in the seat of industry. The Union would seek to extend the establishment of friendly conferences, like those which have proved so valuable in the shipbuilding trade in the north of England, and in the iron and steel trades in the Midlands.

A *Journal* would form another useful feature. There are many industrial improvements which employers have found beneficial in their own works; employers would be willing to publish information thereon if they were asked for it, although they would in many cases decline to take any initiative in the matter. The *Labour Gazette* recently published by the new Labour Department of the Board of Trade has proved a most

¹ Employees in profit-sharing firms have written to the promoters advocating the institution of the proposed society on the above grounds.

valuable addition to the industrial literature of the day. But the complaint is heard in many quarters that merely hard and bare facts—the dry bones of statistics—are there represented, and that no guiding conclusions are set forth. There is clearly a difficulty in a Government Department committing itself to opinions in cases where there is any room for doubt or discussion. The directors of the proposed Journal, while imitating the official scientific precision as to facts, would be free to discuss the *pros* and *cons* of specific Labour reforms, and occasionally to publish conclusions.

In order to round off the tentative programme for the suggested Industrial Union, it may be well to quote here the "Summary of Objects" given in the preliminary circular:—

"1. To promote harmony between employers and employed, by affording opportunities for each side to obtain a better understanding of the other's aims and difficulties, and to realize in larger measure their common interest.

"2. To discuss means by which, without detriment to business, the conditions of labour and the opportunities of workmen may be improved, and to make known, by a monthly journal or otherwise, the results of experiments in this direction.

"3. To foster the establishment, as the way opens, of local branches in the different industrial agricultural centres."

For such a programme, of course, considerable funds would be needed, but the experience of the Anti-Corn Law League, and of other similar institutions, goes to prove that when there is a good cause, and when business-like methods are adopted, the necessary means are readily forthcoming. While such large sums are lavished annually (unproductively) in maintaining the sinews of war for the present sterilizing strife, there should be no difficulty, if common sense is allowed free play, in raising the £1000 or £2000 a year, which might, by removing many of the causes of that strife, add enormously to the productive resources of the country.¹

¹ The travelling and clerical expenses alone in connection with the recent coal dispute must have amounted to several thousand pounds. The claims upon the rating authorities of the West Riding of Yorkshire, arising out of the Colliery riots, amounted to £11,500, which, after investigation, was reduced to £7000 (*Daily papers*, January 9, 1894).

It is not proposed that the Preliminary Conference should start the Association. The promoters suggest that the Conference should appoint a Provisional Committee, which would proceed to draft an outline constitution, and that this draft should then be submitted to the executive committees of the principal organizations of workmen and employers, and also to the secretaries of the chief social and religious bodies. It is felt that the new movement should take advantage of what is sound in all previous movements—should build, so to speak, on the basis of all the good industrial and social work of the past. The present scheme is brought forth in no way as a “pattern from the Mount:” some of the details are almost certainly capable of improvement. When, however, the opinions of the above-mentioned authorities have been received and considered by the Provisional Committee, there ought to be a good chance of starting the Association in an orderly and promising manner.

But practical men will ask, “What practical good can come of it?” They will point to the Industrial Remuneration Conference of 1885, and say that it did not come to much. But one might urge, with some force, that that Conference amply justified itself; many industrial matters were then set before the public in a clearer light than ever before. If the objection be pressed, however, it may be pointed out that the 1885 Conference was, after all, “academic” in its origin and constitution, the great majority of the Committee not being engaged in business. In the present movement, on the other hand, it is proposed that the “business” side shall predominate, while, at the same time, it shall be fully recognized that the assistance of men of thought and social influence will be of priceless value to the work of the Association. A spirit of despair seems unhappily to have seized many benevolent middle-class people. “An idea like the one under discussion is very good,” they say, “but it is only a ‘counsel of perfection;’ with Labour in its present mood, it cannot be successfully worked.” A justly respected dignitary of the Church of England was quoting in conversation the other day the opinion of a large capitalist who, as he said, was utterly distrustful of the present Labour movement.. He urged

that this gentleman was of wide business experience, unimpeachable in character, generous in disposition, a sincere Christian. But has not every movement—Free Trade, Factory Legislation, Free Education—met with opposition from sincere men of this type? In the eighteenth century of the Christian era—barely a hundred years ago—the Corporation of Liverpool conferred the formal thanks of the city, and a purse of gold, upon a prominent clergyman of Liverpool, for having preached the best sermon of the day in defence of slavery. This was an industrial question, and even some Quakers in America were at one time of opinion that certain industries could not be carried on without slave-labour.

An incident which occurred while this Conference was being arranged may be quoted, as suggesting the need existing among some employers for reconsidering their attitude towards trade-union officials. One of the employers promoting the Conference was asked if he knew of a level-headed, fair-minded working man in his town who would be suitable to attend such a conference. He mentioned to me the name of a workman, and, after a pause, continued: "You will be shocked to hear it, but I 'sacked' that man seven years ago for being an 'agitator.' I found that he was talking to my men about the hours being too long, or something of the sort; and I wasn't going to have him upsetting the others with talk of what they were doing in other factories, so I sent him about his business. Yes," he continued reflectively, "I can see now that I was abominably unjust, but I thought then that I was only doing an employer's duty." Here is a parable, as well as a record of fact. This story represents what, in various forms, is going on all over the country. Even Mr. John Burns was dismissed by his employer for attending, as the delegate of a certain society, the Industrial Remuneration Conference of 1885.¹ These intolerant actions towards what are termed "paid agitators" seem to result from one of two conditions. Either the employer has good reason to fear the light that an outside person can throw upon the conditions of his factory, or else he is actuated by feelings induced

¹ *Report of Industrial Remuneration Conference, 1885, p. 485.*

by a hasty and partial survey of the facts of the present industrial situation.

In considering the case for trade-unions, our judgment must not be wholly influenced by the example of the exceptionally benevolent employer. Even with generous-minded employers there is not commonly found an inclination to raise wages without any outside inducement. Brown and Jones are in partnership—unfettered employers are now the exception: Brown says to Jones, "I fancy trade will allow of a rise of two shillings a week to the men in A. Department." Will not the reply be to this effect: "You are a very good fellow, Brown, but this is not a philanthropic institution; the question is, can they get it elsewhere?" And, although there are other causes which sometimes lead to the increase of wages and the reduction of hours, industrial history shows that trade-unions have been the most effective agents in securing these developments—developments which impartial authorities now see to be, in the main, publicly beneficial.

Hard words such as "paid agitator" are productive of strife, and, when examined, how unreasonable does such a phrase appear! In industry, as in other fields, agitation is always a necessary preliminary to reform, and it is difficult to see how reformers can give adequate time to their work if they are not supported by third parties. We should be startled to hear the term "paid agitator" at this day applied to John Bright; yet in all essential features the term is as appropriate to describe his position, as it is to that of a modern Labour leader. It will be remembered that on one occasion Mr. Bright declared that his Anti-Corn Law agitation would have been impossible but for the fact that his brother kept the business going which furnished them both with the means of livelihood. The fact is, the old idea of being "master of one's own business" has, owing to the progress of industrialism, to be surrendered. An economist remarked to me the other day, that at least one satisfactory consequence of the Coal War was that it has shattered the old individualist notion of a business being merely a private concern. As a business man, I have been impressed with observing the disastrous results

of this struggle upon individuals and upon whole circles who have been altogether innocent of the cause of dispute. It is clear that, even industrially, "we are members one of another, and if one member suffers, all the other members suffer with it."

An important question will be as to the probable attitude towards the movement of those earnest-minded men whom the present social confusion has driven into the ranks of Socialism. And here it may be well to state that the promoters indulge in no ambitious dreams of universal comprehensiveness for their Union. The advanced wing of social reformers may think it best to remain untrammelled by even the slight ties of this Society. This need not be deplored: the interests of progress properly demand this advanced wing, for, unfortunately, at the other extreme, there will for some years probably remain a section of self-sufficient, unenlightened employers, whose ears will be deaf to all discussion except the argument of strikes. But the present project may claim at least the fair treatment and the kindly regard of these advanced men. It does not propose to strengthen the position of those who "toil not, neither do they spin." It aims at being a union of those who work with the head and of those who work with the hand,¹ and under its auspices it is hoped that the main bodies of the organizers and the executants of industry may combine their forces. The issue of such a Union may, indeed, well result in furthering the true interests of the propertied class. The instability of industry is rendering large masses of capital comparatively useless.² For a time, the threat of the capitalist may be practicable, and certain portions of capital may be transferred

¹ Much confusion in industrial discussion arises through not distinguishing between the *Entrepreneur* functions and the Capitalist functions of the ordinary employer. The term "worker" in popular parlance is erroneously applied specifically to the hand-worker, the personal service of the head-worker being often ignored.

² "As illustrating the terrible depression which is afflicting our American cousins, a capitalist says that citizens of independent means are so uneasy at the condition of affairs that many will not trust any bank with their substance. Not long ago safes could be had at the Safe Deposits without difficulty; to-day it is almost an impossibility to obtain one. Men and women of high and low degree are withdrawing their bank balances, and entrusting them to the iron grasp of the interest-less Safe Deposit" (London Letter, Jan. 16, 1894).

to other lands. But this is only a temporary expedient. As the measure of enlightenment and the means of inter-communication increase, other countries will be more and more confronted by the Labour Problem. If employers and employed agree with one another, under an era of peace, it may well be to the interest of the capitalist to accept willingly a smaller percentage for the use of his property, in return for increased security.

But, even if the movement cannot be deemed reactionary, Socialists may object—"You will remove the leverage on which we rely by bringing about a higher degree of contentment, good feeling, and prosperity." The promoters cannot bring themselves to view this objection with disfavour. They are disposed to rely on Evolution rather than Revolution for stable progress.

"Is this Jerusalem?" the little children in Peter the Hermit's crusade were wont, at an early stage, to ask in the evening as they sighted each successive town. "No, poor children," as Matthew Arnold wrote, "not this town, not the next, nor yet the next, is Jerusalem. Jerusalem is far off, and it needs time and strength and much endurance to reach it. Seas and mountains, labour and peril, hunger and thirst, disease and death, are between Jerusalem and you."

We may well be grateful to those who place before us the fair picture of an ideal state; we may wisely be willing to pay a certain price for experiments on novel lines; but we must not hasten the break-up of the established order before its day of usefulness is over. For, as Professor Marshall has wisely pointed out, impracticable schemes hinder permanent progress, for their failure causes reaction.¹

Many of the circumstances of the present day are propitious. The industrial revolution may be consummated in a much shorter period than the two centuries which have been required for the political revolution. The Press is in itself a potent agent for progress, and a Labour statesman has recently declared that never before have the chief papers given such fair treatment to the Labour movement as during the year just passed.²

¹ *Report of the Industrial Remuneration Conference*, 1885, p. 173.

² Annual address of Mr. John Burns, M.P., at Battersea, January, 1894.

Our governing bodies have become more democratized than ever before, and the final appeal in almost every sphere is now to the votes of the people, who have thereby attained an immense industrial, as well as political, power.

What is of still more importance, the moral sense of the community has been stimulated and educated. There is a social *renaissance* going on which is quite inadequately reflected in the newspapers. The realization of social wrong and injustice which drives some to "the Square" or "the Park" to declaim against these ills, sends others to the study, to learn the economic basis of our industrial society; and others, again, to Men's Clubs and Men's Classes, to gain, by personal contact, that knowledge of the British workman which is necessary to the proper understanding of his needs and of his aims. The august force of Religion is being slowly, but surely, brought to bear upon the social problems of the day. Secular missionaries are arising in increasing numbers, bent upon altering for the better our ridiculous drink customs and institutions, upon abolishing the slums of our cities, upon procuring for the people freer access to the land, upon many other reforms.

Among this group of helpful agencies, the "Industrial Union of Employers and Employed" seeks to take its place. With so many claims upon the energies of the enlightened social worker, there is, perhaps, a risk that this movement may lack at first the necessary supporters; but this can only be from a failure to apprehend at once its very real importance.¹ Desiring no inaugural flourish of trumpets, but only a fair field for operations, the promoters now submit their enterprise—relying for success on the home-spun qualities of conviction and perseverance, and coveting only, in anticipation of inevitable thrusts of criticism and opposition, the safeguard of old Wotton's hero—"whose armour was his honest thought."

T. W. BUSHILL.

¹ The venerable Mr. Villiers told an interviewer, the other day, that, when he went down to Manchester in 1838, to enlist Cobden's interest in the Corn Law Repeal Movement, Cobden at first said that, owing to political and business engagements, he did not see how he could give time to the movement (*Daily Chronicle*, Jan. 16, 1894).

COMMERCIAL MORALITY.

I. A VINDICATION.

A PAMPHLET¹ with the above title was published last year by the Rev. J. Carter, and I have been earnestly solicited by its author to write an article on the subject for this *Review*. Mr. Carter is fully aware that, whilst I most cordially appreciate his motives and approve his action in denouncing any or all forms of immorality, I differ nevertheless from some of his conclusions. It is, then, in no spirit of controversy, but with a sincere desire to promote issues which we both of us have at heart, that I comply with his request to state my views and some results of my experience of Commercial Morality, viewed from the standpoint of Christian Ethics.

Mr. Carter's pamphlet is divided into three parts. Part I. contains his views as to the moral conditions, in theory and in practice, which prevail in the *ordinary course of business*. They are absolutely and without relief pessimistic. This may be called the *Indictment* of modern Commerce. Being desirous, however, of obtaining "the aid of those who had practical experience and definite knowledge of the details of business life," and in order "to discover the standard which the best business men set before themselves," Mr. Carter has addressed a series of seven questions to a number of gentlemen engaged in commerce and manufactures. Part II. is devoted to a selected number of answers to the seven questions, and may be called the record of *Evidence*. Part III. sums up the evidence and takes a "broad view" of the whole question, which is as gloomy and unrelieved as in Part I., not only as to individual practices, but of the whole system of modern commerce. It may be called the *Condemnation*.

¹ Reprinted from *The Economic Review*, July, 1893.

The Indictment is heavy, the Condemnation is severe. In Parts I. and III., which may be conveniently taken together, it is said (*inter alia*) that—

“when we begin to investigate *the ordinary course of business*, we still find men attempting to justify their actions by arguments which would only be valid if society had degenerated into a herd of ‘gold-seeking animals;’” that “the *prevailing method of doing business* puts a real and severe strain on the consciences of individuals.”

“The futility of the competitive system to insure reasonable terms and common honesty” is broadly asserted, upon evidence which perhaps is hardly sufficient to warrant so far-reaching an assumption. And, by the side of Commerce, as her accomplices, instigators, and panders, are arraigned Competition and Individualism, not merely for their abuses, but as living principles to be contrasted unfavourably with Socialism, which, as a principle, is commended. Political Economy is also accused, under similar counts of the indictment, under the name of the “dismal science,” which Carlyle, in one of his more dyspeptic moods, conferred upon her in that celebrated essay in which he attacked the abolition of slavery and sneered at modern progress and philanthropy. And in the course of the accusation, under the “competitive system” it is assumed that the laws of political economy are made to justify all sorts of trading immoralities: the sweating of under-paid and over-worked labourers, under the plea of “freedom of contract;” adulteration, as being “only another form of competition;” the sale of wooden nutmegs, because “if people will buy them you have a perfect right to make money out of their foolishness.” In all this accusation and condemnation on the author’s part, there is no one gleam of brightness, no admission that there is any honour or honesty prevailing in the course of business transactions. All is sad and gloomy, until one is irresistibly reminded of Vivien’s denunciation of the Knights of the Round Table, when she left—

“Not even Lancelot brave, nor Galahad clean.”

It is not only the mere abuses, the frauds, the sordid

practices which Mr. Carter specifies and condemns ; so far, he is doing his duty, and is deserving of all praise. He also attacks the whole system and framework of modern trade, and, for so doing, he, like all other accusers, is bound to justify himself by ample and complete evidence.

When the Master and Founder of Christian Ethics was upon earth, a fair but frail daughter of Jerusalem was submitted to Him for judgment. Her guilt was manifest, but He neither drew inferences therefrom as to the wickedness of her sex in general, nor did He ordain any change in the laws and customs of the conjugal life. He saved her from a cruel death, but He did not condone her sin ; He enjoined her to "sin no more." But the most useful lesson, that which teaches that no class or caste is free from moral imperfection, is contained in the Master's words to the woman's would-be executioners—"He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her."

Alas for fair Commerce ! she who has been extolled by statesmen, poets, and philanthropists as an ennobling and civilizing influence, promoting the prosperity of all communities subject to her sway, and knitting together the nations of the earth in the bonds of peace and reciprocated benefits, whose mariners were wont to sing—

"On the courses of the deep
With a fearless rein we sweep,
And East and West in bonds of golden amity we bind ;
Like fleet birds on the wing,
From land to land we bring
The reward that lightens labour to the toilsome human kind."

Has she indeed fallen so low, that, grovelling at the feet of her accusers, with her mural crown in the dust, she awaits the doom due to her adulteries ? Is she, or is she not, in the position of the erring daughter of Jerusalem ? It is time to examine the evidence.

Of the seven questions put by Mr. Carter to selected men of business, six refer in detail to various forms of commercial immorality or lack of righteous principle. Such questions

might be multiplied indefinitely, and the answers might be made to fill volumes. From lack of space, I propose to dwell more particularly upon one of these questions only, the first and most important of the seven, and which may be taken to embrace and embody all the others. It runs thus: "Do you find it *difficult* to apply the principles of Christian truth and justice to the conduct of business?" The answers are from seventeen individuals selected by Mr. Carter himself, and I do not think that any class of the community nor any body of Christian men would need, upon the whole, to be ashamed of them. Although one of them is perhaps more cynical than is desirable, they evince a thoughtful consideration of the frailties of human nature; they point out certain special temptations and lament certain abuses which from time to time infest the course of business transactions. Notwithstanding which, the majority of the answers are very far from justifying the sweeping condemnation contained in the pamphlet; and whilst eight out of the seventeen, with certain reservations, deny the "difficulty," only two out of the number declare it to be insuperable.

But is there really *any* position in life, whether connected or totally unconnected with commerce, in which men do not at times find a "difficulty" in reconciling the weakness of human nature to the principles of Christian truth and justice?

Mr. Carter, in Part III., makes a partial admission, indicating that a somewhat higher standard may prevail amongst some of the principals of large commercial undertakings, as distinguished from smaller traders, from whom he appears to have obtained much of his information. But, as if afraid of being too lenient, he immediately quotes from Mr. Herbert Spencer's essay on the "Morals of Trade" (written thirty-five years ago), to the effect that the higher grades of the commercial world are as culpable of fraudulent dealing as smaller traders. But he altogether omits the further remarks in which Mr. Herbert Spencer states that he has been obliged, for the purposes of his essay, to present the (commercial) malpractices alone, "unqualified by the large amount of honest dealing through which they are

dispersed." And, again, that "there is no reason for assuming that the trading classes are worse than any other class," citing instances in support of the contention. And also, that "there is no reason to suppose that those evils are increasing, but the contrary."

Mr. Carter refers to Professor Marshall as an authority on political economy. Let me also call him as a witness for the defence. In the *Principles of Economics* (bk. i., ch. i.), he says:—

"The opportunities for knavery are certainly more numerous than they used to be, but there is no reason for thinking that people avail themselves of a larger proportion of such opportunities than they used to do. On the contrary, *modern methods of trade* imply habits of trustfulness on the one side, and a power of resisting temptation on the other, which do not exist among a backward people." And his marginal references read, "Man is not more selfish than he was, nor more dishonest."

Is it really, then, a possibility that Commerce, instead of being a laggard, may in some humble sense be actually a leader in the paths of altruism?

It may be useful at this stage of the inquiry to make some effort at comprehending the nature and magnitude of that "ordinary course of business" which is represented as being so tainted and corrupt. To the commercial community of this country has fallen the stupendous task of distributing the food, clothing, and all the necessities and comforts of material life to thirty-eight millions of people, crowded into these small islands. Further, the task is complicated by the fact that this population consumes much more food than it can produce. "Business men" have therefore been called upon to invent, create, organize, and maintain those manufactures, and their plant and appliances, by which so large a portion of the population earn their means of existence, by making in this country articles which people in other countries are willing to purchase. The creating and organizing new markets for the sale of such products is a work of absolute necessity, requiring the most indomitable energy and enterprise; the distributing of these products abroad, and the bringing in of the necessary food supplies in exchange, is

"Business." "Business" also means the erection of dwellings and the carrying out of public works; the creation and maintenance of means of transport by means of railways, canals, and by our vast mercantile marine. It also includes our gigantic banking system, one of the most beneficent of modern material developments, by which the use of capital for the wants of the community is cheapened and facilitated to a degree which is often very inadequately appreciated. If we adopt as a moral ideal the theory that an institution, or a caste or a section of a nation, should be judged by the value of its services to the whole community, it might be asked whether, in spite of failings or shortcomings, there has ever been a community, in any age or clime, wherein the material necessities and comforts of life have been so cheaply, so efficiently, and so abundantly supplied to mankind as under the "individualistic" and competitive system, with its power of unlimited co-operation, which has grown up in this country.

This enormous growth of commercial and industrial enterprise in this country, during the present century, is absolutely without parallel. With it has coincided a portentous growth of population within a limited area, which is also without parallel—a fact in itself of the gravest social, political, and moral importance. During an important part of the period which witnessed these developments, the political importance and influence of the commercial classes, at present diminished by extensions of the franchise, may be said to have been predominant. Have the influence and power of the commercial classes upon the whole worked for good or for evil? It was recently announced from the pulpit by a distinguished divine, that, as an outcome of our present social conditions, "the poor are continually becoming poorer, and the rich are continually becoming richer." It is a common feature of clap-trap oratory that all the improvements in industrial science tend to the advantage of the capitalist, and not to that of the labourer. Are these assertions true? Is it not, on the contrary, the fact that the period of this great expansion of "capitalistic" enterprise corresponds with the greatest improvement in the material and social

condition of the labouring population which the world has ever seen ; that all the necessities and comforts of life have been prodigiously cheapened, whilst the wages of labour have, at the same time, been very materially increased ; and that the legislation of the period has resulted in milder penal enactments, political enfranchisement and education for the people, and a host of other ameliorations of the condition of the masses which the world had never previously dreamt of ?

On the other hand, capital, the existence of which is and always must be, under any political dispensation, of vital importance to the labouring classes, has also vastly increased ; but, as a consequence of that increase, it can be and is hired for industrial purposes at rates which have greatly diminished, and are constantly diminishing. In one word, the hiring rate of labour is increasing, whilst the hiring rate of capital is decreasing.

To revert from the general ethics of commerce to the personal ethics of commercial men, Mr. Carter speaks of some Englishmen as shrinking from appearing to act on a moral principle. It is true that most "men of business" are usually somewhat reticent as to introducing the phraseology of moral or religious sentiment into their ordinary commercial conversation, for experience has proved that such coin is often counterfeit. I have at times thought it my duty to advise younger men never to be ashamed of avowing their religion, but to avoid making an ostentatious parade of it. Yet, if we enter the greatest commercial centre in the world, avowals of the duty to God and to our neighbour are not altogether lacking. The arms of London bear the motto, "*Domine dirige nos.*" On the front of the Royal Exchange are inscribed the words, "The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof." The favourite maxim of the soundest men of business is, "Honesty is the best policy." Modern Chambers of Commerce, whilst promoting the material interests of traders by a far-seeing system of co-operation, have not neglected the duty of endeavouring to elevate and maintain the standard of commercial morality. The London Chamber of Commerce might, amongst many other instances, point to

its strenuous exertions with respect to the improvement of the Bankruptcy Laws and its active support of the Merchandise Marks Act, with respect to which last Act a distinguished member of the Chamber, in publicly advocating its adoption, used the argument that "righteousness exalteth a nation; but sin is a reproach to any people."

The Chamber has also established and supports a system of improved commercial education; it has founded a Labour Conciliation and Arbitration Board; and, more recently, it has established, in conjunction with the Corporation of the City, an Arbitration Court for the Settlement of Disputes between Traders. The amount of time, skilled and experienced capacity, and arduous labour which is continuously, ungrudgingly, and (may I perhaps add?) unselfishly bestowed by hard-worked and sometimes over-worked men of the commercial class upon objects of which the foregoing are but samples, may, perhaps, justify a protest as to whether the appellation of "a herd of gold-seeking animals" should, even by implication, be applied to any one class by a preacher of "righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come." I will not dwell upon the amount of pecuniary support which the commercial classes extend to schemes of philanthropy; amongst the talents which it is our duty to use in the Master's service the working head is of even more value than the lavish hand.

Each career has its own special temptations; but a man develops in his ordinary pursuits the character which he brings into them. He who is unscrupulous by nature will be unscrupulous in business, as he probably would be in any other career, or in leading an idle life. But, after forty-five years' experience in commercial and industrial pursuits, I must record my opinion that, taken as a whole, the great bulk of the commercial affairs of this country are conducted with fairness, honour, and honesty; that the standard amongst the "best men of business," alluded to by Mr. Carter, is a high one; and that the "ordinary course of business" is conducted with at least as great a regard to the principles of Christian truth and justice as prevail amongst any other profession or class,

excepting none. During the last few weeks I have taken the opportunity of conversing on this subject with a number of men well known and high placed in the commercial world, and whose ripe experience and unblemished reputation for probity and sagacity would insure respect for their declared opinions. And the result of the evidence thus obtained in every way confirms the opinion which I have just expressed.

"Business" is, perhaps, not the worst school of discipline that can be found; in some cases its code is more severe than that prevailing elsewhere. Take, for instance, the system of credit. Its abuses are cried upon the house-top; they are often immoral and always harmful, but they affect only a very small proportion, comparatively, of the vast volume of commercial transactions. The very extent of the general system of credit, which is as beneficent as it is gigantic, is in itself a proof that commercial integrity is no mere name, but is an article of faith amongst our shrewdest traders and bankers. No commercial man of standing will allow his signature to be dishonoured by a failure to meet his acceptances on the very day they become due, under penalty of the loss of credit and reputation. Were this punctuality not general, gold payments before delivery of the merchandise, or a cumbrous form of barter, which would increase the cost of all commodities, would be the rule instead of the exception. How very small a proportion of the transactions of commerce are settled by the actual transference of specie, may be seen by the returns of the London Bankers' Clearing House, or by the well-known testimony of Sir John Lubbock, who stated that, of every £1,000,000 paid into his bank, only £6210 consists of coin. Therefore, all but 0·621 per cent. consisted of paper of various kinds representing promises to pay. If the losses from default of these promises to pay were not relatively infinitesimal, it is evident that the whole system would at once collapse.

Again, in the ordinary transactions of wholesale commerce in home and foreign trade, merchants and manufacturers base their arrangements upon the faith which they have in the integrity and ability of each other to fulfil engagements of

enormous magnitude for the future delivery of goods at fixed prices, of stipulated quality, and at stipulated dates. Here, again, the whole system of business is founded upon the belief of the shrewdest and most experienced traders, that their brethren are honest, and will fulfil their engagements. It is evident that such ordinary customs of trade afford abundant opportunities and temptations to unscrupulous men, and disputes and lawsuits from time to time occur. And yet it is nothing short of marvellous how small is the amount of default and contention, compared with the enormous volume of commerce, and how honourably such engagements are fulfilled, with exceptions which are proportionately insignificant.

It is difficult to convey by description an adequate idea of Niagara; it is certainly not to be done by drawing samples from little tainted eddies by its shores.

Far be it from me to seek by any *Tu quoque* argument to condone or palliate any form of commercial immorality; still less to deny the many social evils which exist amongst our densely packed population. To assail the immoralities and to strive continually to reduce the evils is the bounden duty of every disciple of Christian ethics. It is the "ordinary course of business" assailed by Mr. Carter which I seek by every humble means in my power to defend, and with it the ordinary course of civilization, with its freedom of choice either of individualism or voluntary co-operation, its splendid record of progress in the past, its almost unlimited prospect of advancement in the future. But I have now to ask whether, in attacking an institution, the fundamental question put to its votaries by Mr. Carter is quite a fair one: "Do you find it *difficult* to apply the principles of Christian truth and justice to the conduct of business?" Let Mr. Carter apply his question to any class or caste the furthest removed from commercial life, either in this, or any previous age. Let him, if he will, include in his question the highest and holiest profession ever exercised, that of the Christian Apostolate, and the men personally chosen by Christ to follow it. Is there one mortal throughout the ages who could truthfully reply that he has found no difficulty, arising out of the

imperfections of his human nature, in resisting the temptations which inevitably assailed him in the "ordinary course" of the exercise of his profession, however noble? The difficulty which Hesiod points out,—the struggle of the soul with the body which Plato so graphically and pathetically describes in the *Phædo*, in the words which he puts into the mouth of Socrates,—the lamentable warfare which St. Paul describes as constantly going on within him,—the faults committed by other Apostles after being clothed with all the plenitude of their Divine mission, all point to the truth which has been acknowledged by all religious creeds and all systems of philosophy. No aggregation or segregation of mortals, no human combinations have ever been able to eradicate the "difficulty" which the selfishness of human nature opposes to counsels of perfection.

If I have in any way proven that, although Commerce may have many erring children, she is rather to be commended for her great and signal services to humanity, and that she is *not* prostrate in the dust before her accusers, then I must further claim, that the proposal to destroy the whole fabric of modern civilization by the hands of Socialism, in order to provide stones for her lapidation, would be a counsel of unreasoning fanaticism and of short-sighted injustice. Socialism is commended by Mr. Carter. Socialism is a watchword and a trumpet call. The word was first applied as a distinctive designation to the doctrines of Robert Owen, Fourier, and St. Simon, and accepted by those teachers. These doctrines comprise, *inter alia*, the denial of revealed religion; the abolition of the family, with such sexual arrangements in lieu thereof as shall here be nameless; and the abolition of the rights of private property. There have been many varieties of Socialists, including Proudhon, who, however, disclaimed the name, and called himself Anarchist, and invented the phrase "*La Propriété c'est le Vol*," also including Karl Marx and the Fabian Essayists. Some form of communism and the abolition of private property or its absorption by the State must, I think, be accepted as a leading principle of all these sects. The rights sanctioned and enforced by the Decalogue and sanctioned by Christ are undoubtedly attacked.

Of the fact that Socialism has in the past and does in the present attack and seek to destroy the family life, there is, to me, no reasonable doubt, and I am confirmed in my impression by Canon Scott Holland, who, in his address at St. Edmund's, Lombard Street, on the 12th of March, is reported to have said that "for Socialism to leave Marriage alone is to leave the foe in possession of all the fortresses."

I acquit him of any sympathy with such impurities. But why does he not denounce and fight the forces which seek, under the sullied banner of Socialism, to destroy the Christian life? The danger of dallying with Socialism may, perhaps, be further exemplified by the remarkable evolution of ideas in the case of so honest and earnest a thinker as Count Tolstoi. In his latest work, the *Kingdom of God is within you*, he has evolved, from overstrained interpretations of Christ's Sermon on the Mount, a doctrine in antagonism (as he admits) to other parts of the Gospel narrative and to the teaching of all the Christian Churches. He attacks the rights of property, denounces the forcible prevention or punishment of crime, disapproves of the functions of magistrates and judges, and of all forms of government.

If the imperfections of our present state of society arise from the frailties of human nature and, amongst them, from selfishness and greed, is it not begging the question to contrast Individualism (with a free right to co-operate) with Socialism, and to say, Here is the remedy? Will any Christian contend that Socialism can apply a moral remedy more potent than Christianity? Do not the records of attempts to found Socialist communities show that greed, selfishness, and competition by violence for the attainment of objects of desire or lust are by no means excluded from such colonies as Robert Owen's "New Harmony" in America? nor have the celebrated Phalanstères of Fourier, nor the "Ateliers Nationaux" of the French Government of 1848, added to the happiness of mankind, except in so far as to teach us what to avoid. Greed and selfishness were not excluded from the communistic experiment tried by the Apostles in Jerusalem. It was a human institution not ordained by Christ.

If we believe in the existence of an All-wise and Omnipotent Ruler, then the laws of all sciences, properly so called, must be considered as His laws, by which He governs the universe.

“For so the whole round earth is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.”

I know that this conception is one which will lend itself to severe, and, perhaps, pitying criticism from many, possibly from most Socialists. Let us, however, be tolerant to each other whilst combating what we think are errors. But I put in one plea for Political Economy for the consideration of Christian men *and* Socialists. According to Professor Marshall, “Economics is the science which investigates man’s action in the ordinary business of life.” Again: “Ethical forces are amongst those of which the Economist has to take account.” Severe reasoning, but not immoral, because it is necessarily concise. And, again:—

“Economic laws and reasonings, in fact, are merely part of the material of which Conscience and Common Sense have to make use in solving practical problems, and in laying down rules which may be a guide in life.”

I am a man of business, who believe that the Ethics of Christianity should preside over the conduct of my daily life. I avow myself, however, as an opponent of Socialism, even when it passes under the name of “Christian Socialism.” In the old, old times one never heard of a “Christian Worshipper of Diana.” Mr. Carter will not grudge or deny to me the support and solace of “Conscience and Common Sense” in the daily encounter with the dread Triumvirate of Evil, which he, and I, and all Christians undergo. And, therefore, rejecting the name of Socialist, I prefer to call myself a “Christian Political Economist,” a very humble votary of the progressive and Ethical Science of Economics.

S. B. BOULTON.

COMMERCIAL MORALITY.

II. A REJOINDER.

[N venturing to offer a few comments upon the foregoing kindly criticism, it is hardly necessary to remark that the impulse is not due to any feeling of chagrin or mere contentiousness. Mr. Boulton has so generously recognized the true aim and purpose of the pamphlet under consideration, that nothing but gratitude is due for his contribution to the better understanding of what is obviously no easy subject. I am bound to confess that in this discussion I labour under a certain disadvantage. Mr. Boulton speaks out of the rich fulness of his own mature experience of the actual conditions of commerce, whereas I can only write as a young man who has approached these questions from a student's point of view. It is possible, however, that the student as such, if he fulfils his task with earnestness and impartiality, may be able to afford some real help in explaining our social and economic problems. That his knowledge is not confined to the range of his own private experience, that he has had time and opportunity to study these subjects in scientific books, and, if he is circumspect, that he has not neglected to test and verify his theoretical conclusions by the helpful criticism of practical men—these are all advantages which he may put to good account in forming reasonable judgments upon everyday affairs. If only the student will frankly recognize his limitations, and will make it quite evident that he does not mean to relieve any individual from the final responsibility of deciding upon his own course of action, it is not likely that he will fare badly at the hands of those to whom he may address his observations upon men and things. Of this fact Mr. Boulton's active participation in

the discussion before us is conclusive proof, and fully bears out what has been for some years my uniform experience in debating these questions with men who day by day have to decide promptly and to act vigorously in view of the particular circumstances of the moment.

In regard to what Mr. Boulton has written, it may surprise him to be assured that I have no hesitation in acknowledging the force of much that he has stated positively. And further, if he will kindly allow me to disavow any sort of responsibility for certain views which he credits me with entertaining, he will probably find that our apparent divergence of opinion will be still more narrowed down.

I. I readily endorse all that Mr. Boulton has so eloquently said in praise of the splendid achievements of commercial enterprise. I cannot doubt either the supreme importance for the national welfare of the functions of capitalist and *entrepreneur*, or the general improvement in the conditions of material prosperity among all ranks of the community; and the part played by credit in business transactions must ultimately depend upon an adequate foundation of mutual confidence in common honesty. Again, I cannot shirk the unhappy fact that the moral standard of individuals in other classes and professions, not even excepting the clergy, may be as much or more open to criticism from the Christian point of view. Perhaps this should have been explicitly stated in the original paper on "Commercial Morality;" and if any words of mine seem to convey the impression that I was comparing the morality of one class with that of another, I would at once apologize. Certainly I had no such intention. Finally, I wholly agree with Mr. Boulton in believing that it is very difficult for any man in any position to be a good Christian.

II. I confess I am rather astonished at some of the views ascribed to me on the strength of particular phrases contained in the original article. And I must beg leave, not only to disavow all responsibility for the opinions suggested, but also to submit that, if my remarks are considered in connection with the context, they will hardly be patient of such a sweeping

application. For instance, Part I. is assumed to be a formal indictment of modern commerce. But in reality the main object of this division is simply to contrast the methods and aims of two systems which seek to explain economic facts without in any way defining the extent to which either system has been actually adopted. And likewise, in regarding Part III. as a wholesale condemnation of business men, Mr. Boulton has apparently not observed the note which explicitly states that "any attempt to estimate the extent of particular practices or methods of business would necessitate a much wider inquiry than has actually taken place."

Again, I am equally at a loss to understand where Mr. Boulton has found reasonable justification for the charge that I brought a railing accusation against Political Economy. It is true that, in the opening lines of the article, there is a passing reference to the old "dismal science" as a thing of the past, but probably economists will admit the implication without recognizing any slight upon their science. And, in fact, the article does not contain a single word of depreciation directed against the modern school of Political Economy; on the contrary, several distinguished economists are quoted, and always with approval.

Once more, the bald statement that "Socialism is commended by Mr. Carter" is calculated to give a somewhat erroneous idea of what I really wrote. It will be seen on reference to the original article, that what I commended was simply the principle of Socialism or co-operation, and that there is no mention of any specific system of Socialism, least of all any ground for suspecting the writer of sympathy with a denial of revealed religion or with attacks on the sacredness of the family.

In regard to particular statements of mine quoted by Mr. Boulton (who alone is responsible for the additional emphasis of the italics), I much regret that I am forced to maintain their literal accuracy. Mr. Boulton admits that there may be erring individuals among the ranks of commerce, but he contends that I am unduly pessimistic. I wish, indeed, that the evidence before me would justify this conclusion; but, in fact, I am

continually receiving fresh information which mostly tends to deepen the seriousness of the situation. I could easily multiply instances, but for the present I will merely quote the comments of a trade journal in an article noticing the original pamphlet on "Commercial Morality."

"No one can refuse to admit the truth of these charges of deceit and dishonesty which are alleged against modern commerce. The struggle for existence is very fierce, especially among those who are only just keeping their heads above water. Homilies from the men who have reached land, or whose fathers placed them high and dry upon the shore, are not always listened to with the utmost patience. Perhaps some of those gentlemen were not so particular when they were fighting the waves. But the struggle is, we believe, being made easier for honest men. Laws affecting adulteration, false trade-descriptions, and bankruptcy are much more severe than they were. All these are steps towards a better state of things, indications of the upward movement of the trading conscience."¹

Perhaps it may be advisable to add that I heartily concur in the above statement that legislation has been producing beneficial results by endeavouring to control and limit the ravages of unjust competition, and that I confidently look for still further advances in this direction.

In this connection I gladly recognize the excellent work that has been accomplished by the London Chamber of Commerce, of which Mr. Boulton is an active and distinguished member. The promotion of measures like the Merchandise Marks Act, stricter Bankruptcy Laws, and Boards of Conciliation and Arbitration clearly points to the need of more extensive legal restrictions upon the selfish greed of unscrupulous individuals, and of what Professor Marshall calls "the moral pressure of social opinion." But even the existing law, as I am credibly informed by competent authorities, is very far from being thoroughly effective. If the present provisions of the statute-book were rigorously enforced, it would mean a very considerable improvement in the general conditions of trade, and a corresponding diminution of the growing stress of unregulated and illegitimate competition. In short, there is good

¹ *The Chemist and Druggist*, Jan. 27, 1894, p. 151.

reason to believe that we are more in need of the vigorous influence of an organized body of public opinion to insist upon a more thorough enforcement of existing legal requirements than of further legislation on the part of the State.

III. In spite of all misunderstandings, due in part no doubt to the necessary brevity of my original remarks, I am most of all grateful to Mr. Boulton for his unequivocal assertion that a business man can, and ought to, act up to Christian principles in the everyday conduct of his life. Here, at least, we are in complete agreement. And, strange as it may seem, this is the very point upon which it is most important to have the generous and outspoken adherence of practical men. Those of us who have been trying all along to emphasize the simple truism that our Lord claims the whole of life are often met with the excuse in various forms, that, owing to the nature of trade or to the stress of competition, it is extremely difficult, if not well-nigh impossible, to carry on business in a strictly honest and Christian manner. It must not be forgotten, however, that a general acceptance of the moral principles of Christianity still leaves for solution a large number of casuistical questions which demand careful consideration. And I may mention here, that an attempt has already been commenced in conjunction with a few experienced men of business to formulate a few more or less definite rules for the guidance of commercial conduct.

IV. In conclusion, it may be well for me to mention the main issues in regard to which, so far as I can understand our relative positions, Mr. Boulton and I will probably agree to differ. (a) In respect of the supreme moral value of the principle of Socialism or co-operation, as opposed to the principle of Individualism or competition, I am unable to abate one jot or tittle of the claim that has been so eloquently made in its behalf by the Bishop of Durham. This much is surely axiomatic from the Christian point of view. And moreover, it should be constantly borne in mind that modern economists have for the most part frankly discarded the old individualistic formula of *Laissez faire*, and hopefully regard the present tendencies of our economic system towards a larger and wider realization of the principle

of co-operation. But this organized co-operation and collective control will, it may be hoped, be something altogether different from that form of Socialism which Mr. Boulton has in view, which may, I believe, be shown to be both materialistic and individualistic, and which I should deprecate as unfeignedly as Mr. Boulton does. With Professor Marshall, then, I cannot regard with favour "the cruelty and waste of irresponsible competition and the licentious use of wealth,"¹ and with him I look for a gradual process of evolution, by which—

"we may attain to an order of social life, in which the common good overrules individual caprice as completely as it did in the early ages before individualism had been developed. But unselfishness then will be the offspring of deliberate will, though aided by instinct; individual freedom will then develop itself in collective freedom, instead of, as was the case in the old times, individual slavery to custom causing collective slavery and stagnation, broken only by the caprice of despotism or the caprice of revolution."²

To make my meaning quite plain, I cannot refrain from quoting one rather long passage from a very remarkable book, entitled *Social Evolution*, which has recently appeared. The author, Mr. Benjamin Kidd, writes with extraordinary ability and freshness, and his treatise is especially interesting, not only because it recognizes and justifies the prevailing tendencies of economic progress, but also because it emphasizes the fact of their dependence upon religious motives and sanctions. After speaking of the part played by "the old *laissez faire* doctrine" in the past, he goes on to remark that—

"the doctrine has no such part to play in the future. In the era upon which we are entering, the long uphill effort to secure equality

¹ Address on "Some Aspects of Competition," in the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Dec., 1890, p. 643. This Address is mainly concerned with the changes in the mental attitude of economists towards competition; whereas, for my own part, I am much more concerned about the moral contrast between co-operation and competition. The whole passage referred to above reads thus: "Every year it is more manifest that we need to have more knowledge and to get it soon in order to escape, on the one hand, from the cruelty and waste of irresponsible competition and the licentious use of wealth, and on the other from the tyranny and the spiritual death of an ironbound Socialism." It is, perhaps, not necessary to add that it is my earnest desire that both of these dangers should be avoided.

² *Principles of Economics*, vol. i. p. 47.

of opportunity, as well as equality of political rights, will of necessity involve, not the restriction of the interference of the state, but the progressive extension of its sphere of action to almost every department of our social life. The movement in the direction of the regulation, control, and restriction of the rights of wealth and capital must be expected to continue, even to the extent of the state itself assuming these rights in cases where it is clearly proved that their retention in private hands must unduly interfere with the rights and opportunities of the body of the people. But the continuity of principle may be expected to remain evident under the new appearances. Even in such cases the state will, in reality, assume such functions *in order to preserve or secure free competition, rather than to suspend it*. Hence the general tendency must be expected to be towards state interference and state control on a greatly extended scale, rather than towards state management.”¹

(b) I must also demur to any identification of the laws of political economy either with the physical or with the moral laws of God. And here, again, Professor Marshall is my authority. The context of Mr. Boulton’s quotation from the preface to the *Principles of Economics* is as follows:—

“It is held that the Laws of Economics are statements of tendencies expressed in the indicative mood, and not ethical precepts in the imperative. Economic laws and reasonings are merely a part of the material which Conscience and Common Sense have to turn to account in solving practical problems, and in laying down rules which may be a guide in life.”²

This is more fully explained later on in the book:—

“An Economic Law is a statement that a certain course of action may be expected under certain conditions from the members of an industrial group: and that action is the normal action of the members of that group.”

“Normal action is not always morally right; very often it is action which we should use our utmost efforts to stop. . . . The existence of a considerable supply of labour ready to make match-boxes at a very low rate is normal, in the same way that a contortion of the limbs is a normal result of taking strychnine. It is one result, a deplorable result of the action of those laws which we have to study.”³

¹ *Social Evolution*, p. 237.

² *Principles of Economics*, vol. i., preface, p. vi.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

With the exception of these two points it will be found, I hope, that, so far as concerns the more positive part of Mr. Boulton's article, we are more in agreement than would appear at first sight. And I beg to thank him again, both for his kind and ungrudging interest in the subject of our discussion (which, I know, he has shown at the cost of some personal inconvenience), and for the opportunity he has given of clearing up ambiguities in my own position.

J. CARTER.

SOCIALISM ACCORDING TO BEBEL.¹

IN the preface to the ninth edition of this book (which is not reprinted in the English version), Herr Bebel observes with some complacency that, like all books, it has a history, only more so ; and he proceeds to dwell with pardonable pride upon the incidents of its somewhat troubled and tortuous career. After the attentions of the Government had secured it a place in contemporary literature, it has been able to drop its thinly veiled disguise of a treatise upon *Die Frau in der Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft*, and resume its original title of *Die Frau und der Socialismus*. In the same preface, Herr Bebel addresses himself to the somewhat superfluous task of vindicating the comparative originality of Mr. Bellamy's *Looking Backward* (he refuses somewhat truculently to own the impeachment of being its "true author"), and of Herr Richter's *jeu d'esprit* upon *Die Irrthümer der Socialismus*. Mr. Bellamy will probably pray to be saved from his friends, for the German Socialist describes his romance in good round terms—in terms, indeed, which only one Socialist can use of another. Just as George was only digging the last ditch of defence for the capitalist, so Mr. Bellamy "ist ein Utopist und kein Socialist ;" which signifies that his picture of the social future is like many good people's idea of heaven—merely the present state of things with its discomforts and disagreeables left out. It fails in "die scharfe kritik des bürgerlichen Gesellschaft ;" it is in fact—and further than this, loss of salvation cannot go—*bourgeois* ; and "a social revolution is not made by well-meaning bourgeois." And so, with an apology for noticing it at all, Herr Bebel leaves "das Bellamy'sche Zuckerwasser" for the consumption of "die Naiven à la Bellamy." As for Herr Richter, our author thanks him (as well as he might) for his contribution of fresh materials to the case against "the middle-class."

Apart from the opportunities the Liberal leader has given his adversary for strengthening the joints of his armour, the later editions of *Die Frau und der Socialismus* have received a great accession of material from the publication of Friedrich Engel's *Der Ursprung der*

¹ *Die Frau und der Socialismus*. Von August Bebel. Zwanzigste unveränderte Auflage. [Dietz. Stuttgart, 1893.]

Familie, des Privateigenthums und der Staats, which is a kind of popularized systematization of the results of Morgan and Bachofen. In the light of these researches, Herr Bebel has entirely recast and greatly amplified the "historical" portion of his argument. It is hardly worth while to dwell upon this part of the book; it has, of course, an electioneering object, but I doubt whether a *mélange* of second-hand "history" to prove a thesis is the most favourable opening up of an *ad captandum* subject. The mere statement of some hasty and unproved generalizations would have probably produced a more effective and undivided impression. Herr Bebel, however, is or professes to be satisfied that Socialism is restoring woman and property to a position which they originally occupied, only at a higher level; and he cites Engels' citation of Morgan to that effect, claiming that the English scholar is more socialist than he knows. Progress takes the form of a spiral staircase in which the last stage stands exactly over the first.

Herr Bebel is careful to point out that his book is in no sense a contribution to the Woman's Question, as popularly understood (any more than Plato's appeal in behalf of citizenship for women was a concession to a movement for Women's Rights); the Woman's Question is to Herr Bebel part and parcel of the Social Question: it is, in fact, the social question in miniature. Woman was the first, and, it would appear, the last "slave." A consideration of the position of women opens up, therefore, the whole question of a reconstructed society in which "economic dependence" is made impossible for woman and worker alike.

After a history (up to date—of Engels) and a theory of the "fall" of woman from independence to dependence, Herr Bebel proceeds to sketch *Die Frau in der Gegenwart*. It need hardly be said that it is a picture of unrelieved gloom; it could not be blacker than Herr Bebel paints it—with a somewhat coarse and hard hand. Some form of marriage is necessary to woman: she mostly does not get it at all, and, when she does get it, it is in the form of serfdom; marriage is either impossible, or increasingly degraded and degrading. There is much in this account that is unpalatable, much that is exaggerated, much that is suggestive. There is also a good deal of doubtful physiology: Herr Bebel does not shirk difficulties, but he thinks that "it may, and under healthy social conditions will, become possible to regulate the sex of children." He is certainly right in showing that the causes of the disproportion of men to women are largely "abnormal" and relative to certain requirements of a military and competitive society. Anyhow—"the axe must be laid to the root of the tree. A healthy manner of

life, healthy employments and a healthy education in the broadest sense of the word, combined with the natural gratification of natural and healthy instincts, must be brought within the reach of all. There is no solution short of this." And, as a peroration to a somewhat unpleasant chapter—"This is the picture of our modern marriage and its results. We see it is an institution most intimately related to the present condition of society, with which it stands or falls; it is impossible to regenerate it within the framework of existing society, and all attempts to do so are doomed to hopeless failure. The bourgeois world is incapable of satisfactorily remodelling marriage, or of satisfactorily providing for the unmarried." Herr Bebel, it must be admitted, is nothing if not thorough, in his diagnosis as much as in his prescription. Then follows a description of "Prostitution, a necessary social institution of the bourgeois world"—as much of a necessary social institution as "the police, the standing army, the church, the capitalist, etc." (I should say that "etc." stands for a good deal in Herr Bebel's rapid methods). This chapter—such is the infirmity of human nature—led us to look more sympathetically upon the bourgeois reticence on these subjects. Herr Bebel then proceeds to deal with "the degraded's" own method of escape from degradation—with the idea of "open careers" to women. As society is at present constituted, women who would be free are only playing the game of the capitalists, who are quick to appreciate the cheapness of "female virtues." However much the industry of women has been "developed," it cannot be said that their social condition has been bettered; on the contrary, it has been made worse. At the same time, "development in this direction means progress," just as the development of machinery means progress, in spite of the demonstrable evils that are incident to the process. And the conclusion is, that "our final aim must be to eliminate the evils occasioned by the advance of civilization, by machinery, improved tools, and the entire modern method of labour, and, while we *retain the advantages, to make them accessible to all members of the state.*" The gains of civilization must be measured by the extent of their distribution. "Consequently we must endeavour to found a society in which all the means of production are the property of the community, a society which recognizes the full equality of all *without distinction of sex*, which provides for the application of every kind of technical and scientific improvement or discovery, which enrolls as workers all those who are at present unproductive or whose activity assumes an injurious shape, and which, while it minimizes the period of labour necessary for its support, raises the mental and physical condition of all its members to the highest attainable pitch. Only thus can woman become as

productively useful as man . . . and be put beyond the reach of every degrading demand."

There is a rift in the lute, however : Herr Bebel turns to remonstrate with certain brothers-in-arms who are not sound on the vocation of woman ; who are, in fact, "not less opposed to the emancipation of women than the Capitalist to Socialism." Our author claims, on the contrary, that all modern improvements push the domestic "drudgeries" of women more and more into the background, and he is as resolute as Plato in his maintenance of the principle that "the only dissimilarity (between the sexes) which has a right to permanence is that established by nature for the fulfilment of a natural purpose, which is externally unlike but in substance the same." And, finally, he makes short work with the alleged inferiority of brain-power in woman, by attributing it entirely to social conditions and arrangements, maintaining, against the in consequence of certain Darwinians, that human evolution is pretty much what man chooses to "make" it.

"The fault is in ourselves, not in our stars,
That we are underlings."

The recognition of women's authority is only a question of time and social transformation. But, as things are, their position is palpably and materially unequal : witness the treatment of woman in the common law of Germany. The concession of political rights must precede the consciousness of political duties. For their "natural allies" women must look to the "proletarians :" together they will present an unbroken front against the broken and confused ranks of the bourgeois.

"Now, the reason for the untenability of our social conditions is the capitalistic system," and Herr Bebel proceeds to a familiar and *con amore* description of its ways and means. The key-note of the description is given in a quotation from A. Wagner : "The social question is the recognized contradiction between our economic development and the social principle of development in the form of freedom and equality, which hovers above us as an ideal, and which is already attaining realization in political life." From this point of view, Herr Bebel attacks our social organization, first of all in relation to trade and industry, and then in relation to agriculture. It is not even "good business," and the consumers pay very dearly for it all. Herr Bebel declines to be held responsible for details, but he has no doubt that "within a given time all the evils described will have reached a point at which their existence will not only be clearly recognized by the vast majority of the population, but will also have become unbearable ; that

a universal irresistible longing for radical reformation will then take possession of almost the whole community, and make the quickest remedy appear the most opportune." And still more explicitly: "If, therefore, [our argument be proved, that] all evils without exception have their origin in the social order of things, i.e., as shown, are rooted in the capitalistic system which rests upon the exploitation and suppression of man by man, and is only rendered possible by the private possession of all the means of production, viz. land, machines, implements, means of traffic, and the source of food—then in *erster Linie* the whole of this private property must be converted by a grand expropriation into social or common property."

Herr Bebel formulates this transformation in terms which are a hard saying for the philosopher. With the new condition of things, the *state* organization loses its foundation, and the *state*—disappears. By which is to be understood that the "*state*" represents (to our author) the organization of force for the maintenance—not of the social will—but of the existing relations of property and social rule. The "*state*" is, in fact, an historical category: it has to make room for "*society*." But we will not pick a quarrel over terminology, but proceed to sketch, as well as we can, Herr Bebel's idea of a "*socialized community*" at work, premising once more that our author only endeavours to "*demonstrate general principles*," "*whose realization can be predicted with proximate certainty*,"—not to forecast details of the institutions which will be most adequate to the demands and circumstances and possibilities of the future. At the same time, Herr Bebel does not admit any scepticism as to the power of society to shape its own course, in accordance with "*the laws of its own development*." The new and "*blessed*" power of construction will be found in the collective will and intelligence of the community: this is an article of faith.

After society, then, has deposed the State and entered into exclusive possession of all the means of production, "*the equal duty of all to labour, without distinction of sex, will become the first fundamental law of the socialistic community*." Society, that is, will take the form of an industrial democracy, organized and resting upon a basis of labour. And by "*labour*" we are to understand, not "*mere activity*," but "*useful, i.e. productive, work*." Upon every member of society an obligation will be imposed to contribute his or her quota to the satisfaction of the ascertained (and presumably reasonable) needs of the community. This being the duty of all, it will be the interest of all to maintain three conditions of labour. The labour must be moderate in amount, it must be as agreeable and varied as possible, and, finally, it must be as productive as possible.

The fulfilment of these conditions clearly depends upon the quality and quantity of the productive forces at the disposal of society, and, secondly, on the standard of life and comfort which society seeks to live up to. And whatever this standard is, it must be universal.

How, then, are we to determine the standard of consumption, and therefore the limit of production? We must have an "executive," or rather a system of local executives, representing all branches of social labour, elected by universal suffrage, and culminating in a "central executive," which is not, Herr Bebel would have us observe, a Government armed with force of supreme power, but a purely business executive (*ein ausführendes Verwaltungscollegium*). A position on this administration is not to be made too attractive, much less a source of exceptional power or income: it is simply a confidential post. The administrator is to be a delegate, not an official: there is to be no "hierarchical system," no idea of permanence or promotion. Finally, and this must be understood once for all in any future organization, there will be no distinction of sex. Herr Bebel does not commit himself to the details of this new organization, but he is satisfied that it "is as far removed from our present system as the heavens are from the earth" (a remark which gives a rather obvious occasion to the enemy).

These executives will have plenty to do. "The chief question will be to determine the nature and amount of forces at our disposal, and the nature and amount of the means of production, such as factories, workshops, the soil, its previous fertility, the existing stores; then to calculate the demand for the various kinds of food, by the average consumption of the population" (no allowance seems as yet made for its increase). The supreme practical and architectonic science will thus be Statistics. In illustration of what statistics can do, Herr Bebel cites (with rather unusual appositiveness) from the experience and working of "combinations," "trusts," and the like. What can be done by and for the capitalist in the way of estimating consumption and regulating production can surely be done by and for the community at large. (The Socialist is here upon good ground, but Herr Bebel is somewhat meteoric when he expresses his conviction that, in a systematic and organized society, the estimate of demand will become so easy that, given some experience, "vollzieht sich das Ganze spielend.")

Consumption being found, the average measure for the "daily and socially necessary labour" required is obtained by a comparison of the statistics of demand (calculated according to circumstances and districts at different periods) with the actual productive powers, technical

and physical, of society for the time being. Outside their share of physical labour required by the community, individuals will have free scope for their tastes and pursuits. All we can say about their "necessary" labour is, that it will be moderate and equable. There will neither be a glut nor a want of work. The producer and the consumer will be brought together, power of purchasing and power of consuming will be no longer different things; such a phenomenon as an overstocked market and a hungry people at one and the same time will be inconceivable. We shall no longer produce "wares" to buy and sell, but requisites to use: the power of consumption will therefore be no longer limited by the purchasing power of the individual, but by the productive power of the community. Given the means of, and the time for, production, every desire can be gratified: there can only be one limit to the consuming power of society, and that is—satisfaction.

As there are no "wares" in the new community, neither will there be any "money." The sole measure of value will be labour; "the working time which the making of an article requires is therefore the only scale by which its social value can be measured." It will depend entirely upon the wants and will of the community, as to whether two, three, or four hours be the working day. The law of distribution will therefore be: To each according to his labour—as a man works, so he receives. Supposing a "fine" suit of clothes cost twenty hours, then the man who wants it must do twenty hours of social labour; but if he prefers to have a suit for eighteen hours, he can do so. A man therefore, by minimizing his wants, can reduce his working day; but he can also, "if foolish enough," indulge in works of supererogation. Will the different members of society, then, be set to work? The answer is rather vague: every one "decides for himself" in what branch of "social labour" he wishes to be employed, and such will be the variety of labour that there will be room for every variety of taste. If, however, there should be a redundancy or deficiency of workers in any one branch, the executive must "make arrangements." (Herr Bebel has not made it clear to what extent variety of consumption will be encouraged or allowed for, and the problem of adjusting individual tastes and social demands is hardly solved by the remark, "In dem Masse, wie alle Kräfte gegenseitig sich arbeitszweige ein arbeiten, geht das Räderwerk immer glatter?" One is disposed to ask, Where is human nature?)

This somewhat limited right to the choice of work is further recognized in the "direction" of it. Foremen will be elected, but they will be "peers of all the other workmen," and, with the

general progress of men and things, we may expect every member to take his turn at ruling and being ruled.

Such an organization will at once raise the motive and product of work to a higher power. Resting as it does upon "perfect freedom and democratic equality," it cannot fail to "awake the highest sense of solidarity, and a spirit of cheerful activity, and call forth a degree of emulation such as is nowhere to be found in the industrial system. And this spirit must react upon the productivity of labour, and the growing improvement of the product." But not only will all be interested in the better quality of work, but also in the simplification and acceleration of the process of production. A premium will be placed upon invention and discovery. There will arise a new, and even fiercer "competition"—as to "who can do most for the common good." Invention, which is at once the robber and the curse of the proletarian, will become the ambition and the enjoyment of all. Individual interests will be as necessarily identical as they are now necessarily opposed (cp. Plato and J. S. Mill).

A new field for social activity will be opened up in the work of raising and adorning the "environment" of labour. Art and invention will be pressed into the service of minimizing the disagreeableness, maximizing the attractions, of labour. The factories and workshops of the future will not only be concentrated, but "will be as different from the present ones as light from darkness." Humanity which "has no rate of exchange on the bourse" will be able to "afford" it. There is death in "*what pays*" the capitalist: "the profit question will cease to play any part in a socialistic society, which knows no other consideration than the welfare of its members." Expeditions "in which there is any prospect of danger" are to be left to volunteers.

Among the "motor powers" of production, electricity has the greatest possibilities, as even bourgeois society has discovered, but only to be "hoist with its own petard." Electricity is a revolutionary agent, and in the new society, whose coming it prepares, it will be enough to produce a material millennium by itself.

As for differences between the "industrious" and the "idle," the "intelligent" and the "stupid," there will (somehow) be none: they are incidents of a bourgeois society. And as for differences in the quality of work, the "moral atmosphere" of the new society will exercise an equalizing influence. If a man is less capable than another, he cannot be made responsible for the faults of his nature; if, on the other hand, he is specially endowed, society cannot take account of that which is no personal merit. (This is certainly

“levelling” with a vengeance; and the philistine will wonder what inducement there will be to the incapable man to be meritorious, or for the capable man to be virtuous. Herr Bebel trusts to the “moral atmosphere.”) And, after all, without society there would be no culture and no “ideas:” the individual is what society has made him, he can produce only what society gives him. Herr Bebel is on clearer ground when he shows that, from the social point of view, distinctions of “higher” and “lower” in regard to physical labour cease to hold. All work of social value is equally honourable. If what is now called the “dirty work” of society cannot be made over to machinery, then every one must take his share of it.

The whole machinery of society will present a transformed appearance. Let it be understood that it no longer produces “wares,” but only objects of use, for its own actual requirements, and “commerce” is at an end. A whole army of exploiters and parasites will be released for the service of the community. The entire system of commerce will be replaced by a central distributive administration—not *state*, but *socialistic* administration,—and that will carry with it a vast simplification of our whole system of traffic and transport. The co-operative store will disestablish the middleman, the small trader, and the private producer. A developed and improved system of communication will favour the decentralization of large populations, and will generally relieve “congestion:” which opens up an enticing vista of the townsman taking his pastime in agriculture, and the countryman stepping across the way to his museum.

But we cannot follow Herr Bebel into his sanguine visions of what society can do in the way of agricultural and industrial enterprise. “Naturally the new community will not be able to solve all those great problems at once, but it will apply itself to them at once. . . . In the course of time it will accomplish public works and solve problems of public interest, which it would make present society giddy even to think of.”

Herr Bebel is not afraid to herald a millennium. “With the cessation of private property in the means of work and production, and hand in hand with their conversion into social property, the crowd of evils has disappeared, which present society disclosed at every step we took.” The dream of the poet, “Unser Schuldbuch sei vernichtet, ausgesöhnt die ganze welt,” will become a working reality. Herr Bebel stands upon the ruins of a shattered world, and describes the Kingdom of Heaven. The “state” and all the things and men of the state will have disappeared (leaving behind them, we should imagine, an “unemployed” question of some moment)—“Ministers, parliaments,

standing armies, police and gens-d'armes, law courts, lawyers, and public prosecutors, prisons, rates, taxes—the entire political apparatus,—to give place to “administrative colleges and administrative delegations, whose function it is to settle the best methods of production and distribution.” “Neither civil nor political crimes or offences are known any longer.” In fact, “all the foundations of the present ‘order’ of things become myths,”—so much material for nursery and old-wives’ tales. As for religion, it will die quietly and be buried decently. There does not seem to be much left, except the (somewhat abstract) recognition “that the highest aim in life is to be a human being.”

Herr Bebel claims that, in the new state, culture will be at once universal and particular. “The conditions of existence will be the same for every one. Needs and tastes will be different; but every one will be able to live and develop in harmony with his own character.” Further, the new society *nascitur, non fit*: a “made” Socialism is a *contradictio in adjectivo*. “Society must develop out of itself, according to its own immanent laws.” (Herr Bebel, after the manner of Plato, seems to oscillate between two points of view which are rather fundamental, at one time putting his faith in “education,” at another in “arrangements.”) From this point of view, every child that is born is a welcome addition to the community; for it will be pretty much what the community chooses to make it. Education will be, up to a certain age, the same for all, and for both sexes; but, at the same time, will not be perfect until there shall be one educator for every ten pupils. And people will be educated in order that they can educate themselves. This will mean not only a new birth of men, but (as Wagner recognizes) a new birth of art. Life, rather than livelihood, will become the object of life in a society in which life is no longer a question of ways and means. The supreme end of life will be recognized to be “joy in living,” and therefore our children must be trained in enjoyment. Education will assume an artistic character: “every human being will become an artist in truth, in one direction or another.” (English readers will be able, by the help of Ruskin and Morris, to continue and develop the connection between “kunst” and “revolution”—on the whole the most fruitful and significant expression of the socialistic revolt.)

Comtists will not like to hear that “Social life will, in the future, become more and more public. . . . Household life will be reduced to the narrowest possible limits, and the widest field will be opened (by means of ‘halls’ of every kind, etc.) for the gratification of social instincts. Life will be at once free, public, and independent.”

But the Comtist has his consolation. "Literary production" will be quite another thing; theological literature will disappear altogether (how about the freest possible "gratification of social instincts"? But Herr Bebel regards religion, like the state, as "a part of their (capitalists') policy"). Legal and constitutional literature would go the same way, were it not that it will satisfy an antiquarian interest. There will be a holocaust of four-fifths, at least, of all the "literary wares" at present circulated. The Press and the whole body of light literature, having no other *raison d'être* than to make "the bourgeois world" appear as the best of all possible worlds, will make way for "science, truth, and art." (Herr Bebel is at times much funnier than Herr Richter or any one else can make him. It is a pity he cannot put his case, which is real enough, with more discrimination. And we "should like to know" how "the production of books" would be managed in a socialistic community; apparently, it will be settled, not by "the favour of the bookseller, the prospects of profit, or prejudice," but by "impartial and qualified judges, whom the author himself helps to appoint." I am not sure that the prospect is very lively: the world would be very dull if it were not allowed to read Dumas, or other naïve transcribers of an unprincipled and unscientific world.)

Herr Bebel does not agree with Aristotle that "the desire of change" is a sign of imperfection. On the contrary, the more completely developed the individual, the more he "wants a change." Change of air and holiday trips will be an indispensable part of any socialistic organization worth the name.

In short, the community will become a universal provider. It provides stores of everything that is and can be wanted; it "provides for its children" (whatever that may imply); it provides for "the aged, the sick, and the invalid;" at the same time, it will provide against "accidents, premature disease, and decrepitude." (For the matter of that, "the conviction that heaven is on earth, and that death means the cessation of existence, will induce all to live as nature directs.") The diet of the new society will, of course, be "rational," and, therefore, mixed; and (we cannot forbear a shudder) "the private kitchen will disappear"—in food, as in everything else, we shall be nothing if not scientific. Everything, too, will be "central:" "central" kitchens, "central" laundries, "central" everything; we shall find, and Herr Bebel generously hopes that Herr Professor von Treitzsche will live to find, "our whole household life radically changed and simplified." (Unless our author's charity outstrips his scientific prevision, we ought to conclude that the "new era" is upon us.)

Well, there you have Herr Bebel's programme. It cannot be said that he conceals anything; the general outlines of the new society are sufficiently distinct. That those who live in fine houses should feel that they are required to give up much, does, perhaps, not so much signify; but may not the "small man" and the unaspiring *hausfrau* feel that they have to give up much, too? It is a question—a question, I admit, of tactics—whether Herr Bebel is well advised in making the prospect unnecessarily alarming and severe.

But Herr Bebel has now come back by a "long route" to "Woman in the Future." He has also to deal with two difficulties of crucial importance, "Internationality" and "Over-Population."

Here is a day in the life of a woman ("of the future"). "Having performed her share of social labour in some branch of industry, the next hour she becomes educator, teacher, or nurse; later on she devotes herself to art or science, and afterwards exercises some executive function. She enjoys amusement and recreation with her own sex or with men, exactly as she pleases and occasion offers."

As for marriage—the bourgeois marriage, a consequence of bourgeois property, will, like so many other things, disappear, and only survive in historical essays. There will be nothing except "household furniture" to leave any one, so that the main inducement to "compulsory marriage" will cease to operate. Marriage is to be a purely "personal and private affair;" there is to be nothing "central" about this institution (at this point, Herr Bebel ceases to quote Plato and Aristotle, and falls back upon "great souls," like George Sand and Goethe, and certain *fin de siècle* novelists). The great thing is, that it should be "free." There may be people who will still think that life is an evil. "What does it matter? The force of natural impulses will preserve an equilibrium." We have nothing to fear (we shall see about over-population by-and-by) from celibates or pessimists. Indeed, the good time—the golden age of which men have dreamed—is coming "with giant steps." The knell of class supremacy, and with it the knell of sex supremacy, is sounding, if it has not sounded. A little later on, we are assured that "the nineteenth century will hardly end before the contest is decided."

In the meanwhile, we may consider the international aspect of the new society. Herr Bebel, in this respect, follows (as throughout) Marx rather than Lassalle; the national idea is a part of the almost old world; the new community will be built up (and seemingly much more quickly than Rome) on an international basis. Weapons of war will be put into antiquity cases, as a sort of reminder to the "new state" of the kind of animal its ancestors were. (Herr Bebel seems

to make quicker work with geographical expressions than he does with the bourgeois state ; it will come about "without trouble," and before the end of the nineteenth century, too. But he does not seem to have enriched this much too scanty section with any fresh evidence.)

Herr Bebel considers, however, that the international standpoint provides him with an answer to Malthus and all his company. From a rapid survey of the globe, he concludes that the "Law of Diminishing Returns" does not apply to existing circumstances, and that what is known as over-population is relative, not absolute ; from the world point of view, it ought to be a means of progress rather than a source of misery. But—apart from the past and the present—can mankind increase without limit, and to the general danger ? Herr Bebel is of opinion that a great many things "will work together in regulating the numbers of human beings, without there being any need for our Malthusians to rack their brains at present," and "in all probability the number of the population will be regulated in future, not by unfounded fears of starvation, but simply by regard to the personal welfare of those most immediately concerned." (Whatever we may think about Herr Bebel's speculations, some of them interesting enough, he cannot be said to have burked the question, and it is to his credit that he sounds a rather uncertain note about it.)

In conclusion, Herr Bebel claims that Socialism is not arbitrary destruction and reconstruction, but a natural, and indeed an inevitable, process of development, and a development moreover that is at length approaching the fulness of time. At the same time, the task of leadership at the next stage of advance will fall to the chosen people of Germany. Germany has a larger proletariat of scholars and artists than any other country ; this is itself a source of discontent and fomentation reaching to the highest ranks of society. It is no accident that Germany is the *locus classicus* of scientific Socialism. Germany is the "heart of Europe" in more senses than one ; it is the centre of science, of dissolution, of reconstruction. And so, in an eloquent peroration, Herr Bebel calls upon his countrymen and countrywomen to labour, without thought of reward, for the good cause of the world.

The readers of this *Review* will be able to form their own judgment upon Herr Bebel's ideas and hopes. The reasonable Socialist will be disposed to exclaim, "It is magnificent, but it isn't business." The Socialist who appeals to history (he might say) should be concerned to show that a new society comes not so much to destroy the past, as to fulfil it. And (he might continue) it is more profitable to discern

NOTES AND MEMORANDA.

LAW AND ORDER LEAGUES IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.— These leagues, which are sometimes called Citizen's Leagues, are established in many cities throughout the States, and often display much activity and exert powerful pressure with a view to the enforcement of liquor laws. They attempt to embody the active expression of public sentiment, and also to a great extent help to create and strengthen it ; and, when it is manifested with sufficient force, the officers of the law are found to be peculiarly susceptible to it.

The constitution of these leagues varies considerably in different States and in different cities in the same States. Their general objects and methods are the following :—

1. To encourage and assist the authorities, and so secure a better enforcement of the restrictive features of the existing laws for the regulation of the liquor traffic : especially (*a*) laws forbidding the sale of intoxicants on Sundays, and during hours when saloons are not legally open ; (*b*) laws forbidding the sale of intoxicating liquors to minors under sixteen, in some States under eighteen ; (*c*) laws forbidding the sale of intoxicants to intoxicated persons, or to habitual drunkards, or to those concerning whom notices to saloon-keepers have been given by relatives, or public authorities, not to supply them with intoxicating liquors ; (*d*) laws forbidding Sunday trading.

2. To use the utmost endeavour to prevent licenses being issued to persons of bad character.

3. To reduce the number of licenses.

4. To give advice and legal assistance to persons desiring to take proceedings under the Civil Damage Law ;¹ and to assist relations to

¹ The following is a fair example of a Civil Damage Law : " Every husband, wife, child, parent, guardian, employer, or other person, who is injured in person, property, or means of support by an intoxicated person, or in consequence of the intoxication, habitual or otherwise, of any person, shall have the right of action in his or her own name, severally or jointly, against any person, or persons, who, by selling or giving intoxicating liquor, have caused in whole or in part such intoxication." In Nebraska the liquor-seller is responsible for all damages sustained in consequence of the traffic, including the support of widows and orphans and paupers.

issue notices to all saloon-keepers in the locality not to supply liquor to those who are victims of the drink curse.

5. To warn saloon-keepers who are offenders that strict compliance with the liquor laws and with the conditions under which they hold their licenses will be rigidly enforced.

6. To prosecute witnesses who commit perjury when giving evidence at trials for breach of liquor laws, or at trials under Civil Damage Laws.

7. To challenge jurors, who may be interested in liquor traffic or otherwise prejudiced, when such are appointed to serve on trials of this nature.

8. To employ detectives when necessary to secure evidence or to detect breaches of the laws.

9. To keep a sharp look out for violation of the law, by visiting saloons and otherwise; and, after detection, to take steps to have the licenses revoked, or at all events to bring the offenders to justice.

10. To receive complaints, collect evidence, and prosecute, when detected, all breaches of the liquor laws.

11. To arrange for a daily attendance at police courts for the purpose of investigating every case where a minor or drunkard is brought up for intoxication, and to take proceedings against those who supplied the liquor.

12. To see that the police and others enforce unremittingly all laws against drunkenness, and that they unfailingly bring to notice all breaches of the liquor laws.

In Boston the league claims credit for having in ten years reduced the licenses from 2600 to 896. The league in the town of Lake (now annexed to Chicago) have been very successful in diminishing the evils of drink; in 1881 there was a population of only 86 to each license, whereas in 1885 there were 300 people to one license, with the apparent result of a reduction of arrests for drunkenness from 620 in 1881 to 400 in 1885. As a result of the league's work in Chicago, where the law forbidding minors being served with intoxicants is vigorously enforced, it is claimed that fewer boys and girls are found in the saloons than in any city in the world under license laws. It is obvious that the reduction in the number of licenses would materially lighten the work of a Law and Order League, as inspection is much easier when the number of places to be visited is reduced. High license, when first adopted, has always the effect of reducing the number of licenses, and for the time being is useful in assisting the work of the league. In time, however, the remaining saloons are enlarged, and thus no great lasting benefit accrues from high license.

The magistrates and police generally are in full sympathy with the action of the league, but, on the other hand, the grand jury and municipal authorities are not always found to lend the support to the league which it has a right to expect.

It sometimes happens that a league goes beyond what public opinion approves, and in such a case a collapse is nearly certain to occur. But speaking generally, these associations have proved themselves most useful agents in minimizing drunkenness and in enforcing laws restricting and controlling the liquor traffic. And even in England, where the inhabitants are apparently more law-abiding than in America, it can hardly be doubted but that similar societies would find ample work to do, and might prove themselves equally useful in enforcing law and order.

The above information is taken from Mr. Fanshawe's account of "Liquor Legislation in the United States of America and Canada" (Cassell), which is a really valuable contribution on this important subject. But although the title-page states it to be a "Report of a Non-partisan Inquiry on the Spot, undertaken at the request of Mr. Rathbone, M.P.," it may perhaps be questioned whether the author has always succeeded in realizing the ideal of strict impartiality.

G. HERBERT BOLLAND.

A FEW FACTS ABOUT THE "LIVING-IN-SYSTEM."—Under this system, which is adopted in most firms engaged in the wholesale and retail dry-goods trade, the assistant undertakes to do his or her work for a fixed salary and board. The latter includes (or is supposed to do so) food and sleeping accommodation ; also a room or rooms to which the assistant can retire when the daily work is done, and, in many of the larger firms during the last few years, a separate room has been provided for each sex ; as well as libraries and recreation clubs, at the joint expense of masters and assistants. But in a great many firms no such provision is made, and multitudes of assistants, chiefly young men and women, have to spend their spare time, either on the streets, or at cheap places of amusement, or in their cold bedrooms.

The system must be considered from two points of view, that of the master, and that of the assistants. The advantages from the master's point of view may be briefly stated as follows : (a) It costs him less to board his assistants than to give them the necessary increase in salary ; also the greater the number he provides for, the cheaper rate it costs per head. (b) In cases of emergency an assistant can always be found on the premises. (c) Under the code of rules and fines,

which each master draws up for the carrying on of his business or control of his assistants after business hours, he can prevent any attempt at the formation of protective unions on the part of his assistants, which the most thoughtful admit to be a growing necessity. (d) While the hours of business are limited to the public, the assistants may be and are kept working overtime without receiving extra pay, as the salary is always fixed. On the other hand, the advantages to the assistant are very limited in number, being chiefly confined to this, that he is certain, at least for a limited period, of receiving food and lodging. The disadvantages under which the assistants labour by reason of this system are many, since it has become, in the hands of unscrupulous firms, an elaborate and cruelly devised scheme for getting the largest possible amount of work for the smallest possible pay out of their assistants, and through its abuses the bodies and souls of numbers of young people are yearly destroyed. In many houses the food provided is of very inferior quality, and badly cooked ; while in others the amount doled out is not sufficient to keep body and soul together, thus forcing the assistants sometimes to provide as much as 4s. to 5s. worth per week of the necessaries of life, and this out of salaries of £25 to £30 per year. In one house known to the writer, men spent that amount in providing breakfast and supper alone, though such meals were included in the stipulated board. In one instance, an employer is reported to have attempted to make a contract with a butcher for the supply of his tainted meat, at a very low cost, for the use of his assistants. Another serious grievance is, that they are always liable to be called away at any moment from their meals to serve customers, and then, when the customer has gone away, have to return and make a hurried meal. Again, it is quite possible for both master and assistants to be robbed by an " unjust steward " who is open to receive commissions, which commissions must, in the long run, be paid for either by the master, or by the men, who receive inferior qualities of groceries or meat. One such gentleman in a West-End house increased his salary by about £600 per year, till he was found out.

The Shop Hours Act of 1892 in no way protects those assistants who are over eighteen years of age from working overtime in retail shops. Only apprentices are affected by this Act, which limits their hours of working to seventy-four per week ; and, though shops may be closed to the public, yet I have known assistants compelled to work as many as ninety hours per week—which are too long hours in any trade. No pay for overtime is given, as salaries are fixed at so much per annum. All overtime is extra profit to the master ; and if the

hours were reduced in any way, it would necessitate a greater number of hands being employed, which would tend to relieve the already overcrowded labour market.

An assistant dare not complain ; if he was bold enough to do so he would be dismissed at once, and probably lose his references. But it is in private dressmaking establishments that the female assistants suffer most. Outdoor hands can legally claim extra pay for overtime, and refuse to work after a certain period, but the indoor hands must labour on till eye and brain are wearied out, *i.e.* till they can do no more. Cases are quite common where assistants have only a few short hours on a Sunday to take outdoor physical exercise, all the rest of the week being spent in "work and sleep." Their lives end prematurely, hastened in many cases by drugs and drink.

Often the sleeping and sanitary accommodation is disgraceful and unhealthy in the extreme. Small overcrowded rooms, badly ventilated ; walls reeking with damp ; and across the floors vermin of different kinds, from rats to beetles, chase each other in search of food ; while the pure and healthy must share the same room, and often the same bed, with the impure and unhealthy, and medical men alone can estimate how much disease is spread by such a wretched state of affairs.

Again, as to fines, though it is illegal to deduct them from the stated salary, yet they are constantly imposed ; the assistant must either pay, or go and seek a situation elsewhere. Should he so refuse to pay, and be dismissed for his temerity, his references can easily be spoilt ; and should he attempt to bring his case before the courts, his chances of employment become very small. One House in the north of London had ninety-seven rules, and a fine, varying from three-pence to five shillings, was attached to each.¹ At the end of a month

¹ RULES, FINES, ETC.

1. The shop is open at 7 a.m., apprentices to be down at this time. Each new assistant must be in shop at 7.30 ; take his turn at morning duty as per list, other assistants to be ready for business at 8.20. Fine 3*d.* and 1*d.* for each five minutes late.

2. Putting up blinds or wrappers at close of business without shop-walker's sanction, fine 3*d.*

3. Neglecting to attend at proper hours as per list for staying in, fine 2*s.* 6*d.*

4. Assistants must not go to meals out of their turn without direction from buyer or shop-walker, who arrange what parties they belong to ; fine 6*d.*—Time allowed for breakfast and tea, twenty minutes ; dinner, half an hour ; for exceeding this time, fine 3*d.*

6. Assistants going out on business must have a form signed by buyer, and countersigned by manager, which must be given to the watchman on duty. Exit and entrance by Sussex Road. Fine 1*s.*

7. No parcel must be taken off the premises without the permit of the firm in

there was not much salary left for some assistants, especially if the shop-walker or manager had a spite against them.

writing, or of the parcel-manager, which must be handed to the watchman on exit ; omission 2s. 6d.

9. Gossiping or acting in any unbusinesslike manner is not permitted, and any work done not appertaining to business during business hours will incur a fine not exceeding 2s. 6d., at discretion of shop-walker or buyer.

10. Standing on a chair, fine 6d.

11. Not using taper or electric lighters to light gas, fine 2s. 6d. and reported.

14. Customers must not be transferred without consent of buyer or shop-walker ; fine 6d.

15. Permitting customers to go unserved, without calling special attention of buyer or shop-walker, fine 1s., second offence reported.

16. All piece goods must be cut from the outside, and every length measured before the customer ; fine 1s.

19. Ribbons—for leaving less than one yard on roller, fine 1s.

20. For cutting any length of goods measured up without shop-walker's permission, fine 6d.

22. No one to leave counter without permission of shop-walker or buyer ; fine 6d.

24. Assistants not to pass through Music, Millinery, or Underclothing Departments ; fine 1s. If business requires them to go to the Costume, Mantle, Blacks and Outfitting or Boot Departments, they must go straight through between the centre passage ; fine 1s.

26. For all goods sold a bill and duplicate must be made out, the money tendered must be entered at the left-hand bottom side of the bill, and the customer's attention is to be called to the amount. The bill and duplicate must then be placed with the money in the cash ball before the customer, and sent from the station to the cashier's desk ; on its return the ball must be opened before the customer, and the change (if any) counted and handed over.

Fines not exceeding 5s. for omission of any of these particulars at discretion.

For leaving bill or cash in ball, fine 6d.

28. Assistants sending bad coin to the cashiers will be fined 1s., and any loss arising therefrom they will have to defray.

34. Assistants taking orders for goods that are to be made up, must first ascertain whether the purchaser is known in the counting-house ; if not, a deposit or reference must in all cases be requested. Omission, fine 2s. 6d.

40. Check-books must be added up each day by assistants ; fine 3d.

41. Any error in addition, fine 3d.

42. Omitting to enter duplicate in index, fine 3d.

43. For entering an unpaid bill in paid column, or *vice versa*, fine 3d.

44. Using the same book for two consecutive days, fine 1s.

45. Misplacing check-book, fine 1s.

46. Losing check-book, fine 5s. and reported.

47. Losing duplicate, first offence, 2s. 6d. ; second, 5s. and reported.

48. Passing duplicate to desk without bill, or *vice versa*, fine 2s. 6d.

49. Indistinct duplicate, fine 6d. each.

50. Department abbreviations must be put first on every line sold, and the article must be fully defined on each bill.—*Important*, fine 1s.

51. For alterations or erasures on bills or duplicates after signature of buyer or shop-walker, fine 5s. and reported.

This set of Rules will serve as a specimen. It has been abolished in this particular House, but there are yet many Houses where similar codes are in force.

52. Undercharges on bills will be debited to assistant and examiner, half each, and overcharges ditto.

58. When goods are to be paid for on delivery, bill and duplicate must be made out with full name and address. Bill to be taken with parcel to parcels office. Duplicate to counting-house, where it will be signed for. Fine 2s. 6d.

59. Not making bill out as soon as purchase is made, not tying goods together as soon as called back, and not taking to parcels office at once, fine in each case, 6d.

60. Consent of counting-house must be first obtained before permitting customers to take an unpaid parcel. When sanction is given, customer's signature must be obtained on duplicate. Fine 1s.

64. All parcels to be delivered must have a "write plain" with name and address in full; and state whether paid or unpaid, book and duplicate number, date, and signed by shop-walker or buyer; fine 1s.

65. Filling up "write plain" paid, when parcel is unpaid, or *vice versa*, or omitting either, fine 2s. 6d.

Any loss arising in consequence to be made good by assistant.

67. Parcels to be called for must be taken at once to parcels room, with "write plain" duly filled up; fine 1s.

68. Wrong or insufficient address, fine 2s. 6d.

69. Not correctly spelling names, fine 1s.

73. Special orders taken must be entered in general book, for which *see buyer*; full name, address, and all particulars must also be noted. If orders cannot be executed to time or instructions, a letter of explanation must at once be sent. Fine 1s.

74. For sending out goods to pay, when they should be on approbation, fine 2s. 6d. and reported.

76. A "write plain" must be made out for approbation goods, the articles being specified at back, and the whole to be taken to the counting-house to be entered and called back. When silks are sent the buyer must always make the entry. Fine 2s. 6d.

77. Assistants taking goods on approbation must obtain a special check-book, a pass, and official receipt from counting-house. A delivery sheet must likewise be obtained from parcels room. Fine 1s.

78. When approbation goods are brought back they must be made returned. The delivery sheet signed and passed into office with any money received; if no money is taken the blank receipt must be returned. Fine 1s.

79. When goods are returned that are not paid for, they must in every case be taken AT ONCE to the credit office and entered; fine 2s. 6d.

80. For any fresh goods purchased a new bill and duplicate must be invariably made out; fine 2s. 6d.

81. When paid goods are brought back to the counter by a customer, credit must be given on the bill made out for the new purchase, and this credit must be signed by shop-walker or buyer, but if goods in lieu of those returned are not supplied at the time, then the goods brought back must be taken to the credit office and a paid-

Many thoughtful observers have to admit that the system is a direct cause of much prostitution and immorality. The masters do all in their power to prevent early marriages by refusing to engage married men, or by refusing to allow assistants in their employ to marry and continue in their service, for an unmarried man can and will work for less wages than the married. One result is, that no secret is made of "illicit connections," and assistants become more careless and indifferent to married life as years roll by. One gentleman in this district gave it to the writer as an unbiased opinion, that much immorality and suffering was directly traceable to large houses of business where the system is in vogue. In cases of illness, very little care or attention is given to invalids, whether the illness be caused by carelessness or insanitary conditions. In some houses invalids must either get well or leave, and for every hour spent away from business a portion of the wage is deducted. For those who are homeless the prospect is appalling; and lucky they are, if it is possible, to get sent to some hospital close

goods return form obtained and filed. When order is executed the return will be deducted in the counting-house on production of the form. Fine 2s. 6d.

82. When a customer claims credit for some goods previously returned, assistants must in all cases get the deduction made in counting-house.—*Most important, fine 2s. 6d.*

86. For omitting to put in a call form for goods to be brought back, fine 1s.

87. Assistants must in every case follow up their call forms the day after filing; fine 6d.

91. When salary vouchers are put in, days absent must always be deducted; omission 1s.

92. For any indistinctness or inaccuracy in names, fine 1s.

93. Instructions for letter to be sent to a customer must be handed to corresponding clerk, plainly written on a correspondence form, signed by the assistant and countersigned by buyer or shop-walker; fine 1s.

96. Any complaints made per letter must be answered the same day; fine 1s.

97. Orders over £5 in the following departments must be entered at once in the book kept for the purpose: Black and coloured costumes; mantles; carpets; ironmongery; bedding; furniture; blinds. Omission, 2s. 6d.

DOMESTIC RULES.

For remaining out after 11 o'clock p.m. (Thursday 12 p.m.), fine 1s.

For sleeping out without the consent of the firm or manager, fine 2s. 6d. Second offence, dismissal.

Breakfast will be on the table on Sunday morning from 8.30 to 9.15. Dinner at 1 o'clock, tea at 5 o'clock, and supper from 8.45 till 9.15.

Assistants are expected to vacate their bedrooms sufficiently early to prevent any obstruction to the housemaid in the discharge of her duties before 11 o'clock; fine 1s.

All lights in the bedrooms must be extinguished by 11.15; fine 2s. 6d.

Talking in the dining-room during meals is strictly prohibited; fine 6d.

by. During the last influenza epidemic many valuable lives were lost through want of care and necessary attention. Each house ought to have a sick ward : some houses that I know have such convenience, and it certainly ought to be copied by more.

The too long hours worked in hot, dusty, badly ventilated shops, amidst the poisons generated by the various dyed goods, rob the assistants of much of their physical vitality, so that, when the day's work is over, they are almost too tired to take the necessary amount of outdoor exercise. As a consequence, latent diseases speedily become aggravated, especially lung complaints and consumption. In many towns masters themselves have admitted the necessity for a half-holiday if their assistants and themselves are to keep healthy ; for, unless they are so, it is impossible for business to be done either properly or profitably. Each day increasing competition makes it harder for the senior assistants to retain their berths ; on every hand the seniors are being displaced by the juniors at lower rates of salary, and nothing remains for the displaced man, if he has no capital, but to recruit the ranks of the 'bus and tram men, or, as is common at Liverpool, become a casual docker.

A very great deal more can be said on both sides of this question ; but, as a system, it lends itself in a peculiar way to tyranny and oppression, fraud and deceit. The public, as a body, know absolutely nothing of the inner working of some big firms, whose fine buildings command admiration from the beholder, but little do they know of the miserable, worrying existence lived by those whose labours have gained such profits for their masters. It is quite time that those who are studying social questions should turn their attention to this system. Shop-assistants are a necessary portion of the community, and minister in a great degree to the comforts of society at large. In conclusion, permit me briefly to suggest one or two ways in which much good could be done.

I. The Shop Hours Act, 1892, should be so altered as to include, not merely persons under eighteen, but all females, in regard to the maximum number of hours allowed per week, viz. seventy-four, including meal-times.

II. Inspectors, with a full knowledge of sanitary requirements, should be appointed and empowered to visit and inspect every place of business where assistants live in. Special attention should be given to bedrooms, urinals, etc. ; and their complaints should be made direct to the County Council, and their dismissals from their posts should be in the hands of the Local Government Board, the nature of their work being such as to expose them to much suspicion from business houses.

Each place should be inspected periodically, and not simply upon the complaint of assistants. Also all such business houses should be registered as factories are.

III. Nothing but a trade union will really do much good to assistants as a class. It could find plenty of work in seeking to abolish fines, defending its members from unjust dismissal, bad food, insanitary accommodation, besides giving them a higher moral tone, more real independence, and true brotherly kindness one to the other.

C. R. FENDER.

THE "TUCKER VILLAGE SETTLEMENTS" IN VICTORIA, of which a brief account appeared in this *Review* last October, are making very satisfactory and encouraging progress. The number of settlers has increased to nine hundred, who appear to be thoroughly in earnest, inspired with unity of purpose and practical brotherhood, contented with their prospects, and quite determined to do all in their power to make each settlement a complete success, and fully to justify the hopes of the promoters of the scheme.

If the man who makes two blades of grass grow where before there was one is a public benefactor, then these settlers, who not long since were "unemployed" in the crowded city, or were only "living from hand to mouth," have, instead of being pauperized by the aid judiciously offered them when unable to help themselves, repaid that assistance with interest, and, in their turn, become benefactors of the entire colony, since, by their industry, skill, and combined exertions, they have transformed large tracts of bush and scrub into productive fields, profitable gardens, wealth-giving dairies; while they have established for themselves comfortable rural homes, amid healthy and pleasant surroundings. By neighbours in their respective districts they are therefore not looked upon as intruders, but welcomed as desirable residents, whose advent is for the advantage of all. They themselves fully realize that, in return for their labour, they now get something more than their "tucker"—that they have improved their circumstances and their prospects by exchanging the fierce competition of the city for the freer conditions of country life. With good meat supplied at one penny a pound, and milk at one halfpenny a gallon, with no outgoing for wood, water, rent—everything being conducted on the co-operative method,—they find that an entire ordinary family can be maintained for about half the cost of the rent of the miserable tenements many have occupied in the slums. It is not, therefore, strange that not one per cent. have returned to the city.

There are no public-houses on the settlements, and this absence of

alcoholic liquor is, doubtless, a great factor in the success of the experiment. Though the main principle of working is that of co-operation, care is taken at the same time to judiciously develop individuality, and to give the freest scope for the exercise of the peculiar talents or capabilities of each settler. The aim of the promoters is to steer carefully between cut-throat competition and the absolute subordination of individuality.

The Premier of Victoria lately paid a visit of inspection to the settlements, and expressed great satisfaction with all he saw of their working. It is evident that they are the precursor of many others of a similar character, for, after consultation with Mr. Tucker, the general plan has been adopted in South Australia and in New South Wales, and the Government of Tasmania has applied to him for advice with a view to its introduction into that unprogressive island. At the Australian Church Congress held at Hobart, in January, Mr. Tucker was to read a paper explanatory of this village settlement scheme. Thus is he teaching the senators wisdom.

It may encourage others to know that the prime mover in this beneficent scheme is not, as might be supposed, one who has abundant leisure, but the busy, hard-working incumbent of a populous parish in the suburbs of Melbourne, where his power of organization and business abilities, as well as genial disposition, have enabled him to carry out large enterprises for his people's good with marked success.

As priest-in-charge for five years of an extensive country district with ten clergy under his superintendence, Mr. Tucker became familiar with "bush life" in all its aspects, and as incumbent for the last thirteen years of a large Melbourne parish, he has gained valuable experience of both poor and rich in a crowded city. He was thus led to see that a solution of some pressing social difficulties was to be found by placing, under certain conditions, the unwillingly idle men of the towns upon the idle land of the country, and, by irrigation and intense culture, to make the land furnish its largest results, to yield every penny that it is worth. A little more than two years ago he formulated his scheme, applying the methods of co-operation, division of labour, and profit-sharing to agricultural settlements. Both financially and socially it has proved a decided success.

With the object of popularizing and more widely disseminating his views, Mr. Tucker has, in accordance with the custom of the day, written a description of the village settlements in the form of a novel, which, under the title of *The New Arcadia*, has been just published in England by Messrs. Swan Sonnenschein & Co., and in Australia

by Messrs. George Robertson & Co. The story itself is full of interest, and written with much dramatic power; character-sketching is, however, subordinated to social purpose.

He strongly deprecates the short-sighted and selfish, if not actually criminal policy which makes it possible for men and women in great cities to be seeking work in vain, or begging for the necessities of life, while there are thousands of acres of unoccupied land in Australia where productive work may be found for more than double the population of the colonies. He would answer the bitter cries of the submerged outcasts of the great cities of the old world by a generous and wise invitation to an occupancy of some of the thousands of acres of the lands of the new. But in emigration he would have individualism superseded by co-operation. He gives a vivid description of the evils of the former method. After showing that when "one only master grasps the whole domain" the land does not yield her increase as it might, he proceeds to show how by co-operation and scientific tillage the same wilderness may be changed into a smiling plain, where "peace and plenty cheer the labouring swain."

To those who know nothing of the village settlements, this book might seem a mere string of Utopian fancies, whereas it is for the most part a record of facts within the experience of the writer.

It is clear, however, that he has not yet been able fully to reduce his theories to practice, for he suggests that the managers of hospitals, benevolent asylums, etc., might do well to dispose some of the inmates of those often over-crowded institutions amongst rich, picturesque lands in the country—each settler with his little plot to till, pigs and fowls to tend, etc. Apart from the industrial settlements, he would like to see organized, charitable communities where, perhaps, persons might live longer and more happily than under present circumstances,—where, rescued from the mechanical life in the wards, they could turn their almost spent powers to some practical use, and realize the blessedness, in more senses than one, of the promise, "At eventide it shall be light."

H. C. HANCOCK.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE TO AGRICULTURE IN SWITZERLAND.—The canton of Berne has for many years taken an active part in promoting agriculture, and always takes a great interest in all questions affecting the welfare of the peasantry. It must be clearly understood, however, that in Switzerland agriculture is a concern of the various cantons, which act quite independently of one another; and although in some cases two or three cantons may combine in order to conduct some

work, yet they act on their own responsibility, and are quite independent of the Federal Government.

Before examining the work of the canton, it would be well to take note of the existence of the Berne Economic Society ("Ökonomische und gemeinnützige Gesellschaft des Cantons Bern"), which is an important factor in all agricultural affairs of the cantons. This society, which numbers some four thousand members, is an amalgamation of the various district societies of public utility, and receives a yearly subvention from the state.

The importance of the society lies in the fact that, although the canton acts on its own account, most of the aids which are given to agriculture are paid in equal shares by the canton and the Economic Society. For instance, supposing that a certain commune wishes to execute some scheme for draining a certain portion of its land, it applies through its own representatives to the Economic Society for a subvention. If the society approves of the undertaking, it makes a grant, and recommends the canton to do the same. The Economic Society and the canton usually work together in the most complete agreement, and the Minister of Agriculture of the canton is always a member of the board of the Economic Society. It was under the auspices of the society that a great agricultural exhibition for the whole of Switzerland was to have been held last year, but owing to the severe loss entailed by the drought it was postponed till 1895 or 1896.

The work of the canton proper falls under two chief heads : (a) The maintenance of an agricultural college ; (b) works of public utility, which vary from year to year. (a) The agricultural college is at the Rütli, about four miles from Berne, and besides all the necessary farm buildings, has fifty-five hectares of land and about thirteen hectares of forest. It is mainly frequented by the sons of small peasants, who receive a first-rate agricultural education. In the year 1892 there were seventy-three pupils, of whom forty-three came from the canton of Berne, twenty-eight from the other Swiss cantons, and two from other countries. The fees are very moderate ; members of the canton pay only three hundred francs a year, others four hundred francs. The expenses of the college are defrayed by the canton, and may be said to amount to between thirty-five thousand and forty thousand francs yearly. The reports show evidence of good work. The directors complain that they do not get the cleverest youths, the peasants apparently preferring to apprentice their most intelligent sons to other trades, but on the whole they find that those who do come to the college are industrious and painstaking. Naturally the winter months

are devoted to theoretical teaching, and the summer to practical experience. In the summer visits are occasionally paid to other farms, so that the students may have an opportunity of seeing various methods of agriculture, and in winter they have to take their turn in stable-work. At the same time, all kinds of experiments are tried which can in any way benefit or improve agriculture, such as new methods of manuring, and the employment of new kinds of machinery. In this way the directors endeavour to make the college a training-place for young farmers, and also a model to all other farms in the canton. The last two or three years have proved very successful. (b) The activity of the canton has also been shown in various undertakings for the benefit of agriculture. For instance, in 1892 successful experiments were made in regard to sprinkling potato plants with a chemical compound so as to prevent potato disease. A committee of experts introduced a number of improvements in cheese manufacture. Subventions were granted to many communes for drainage and manuring purposes, and large subventions were given to communes which had suffered from hail and inundations, as well as to several Alpine villages, in order to establish mountain refuges and to construct new mountain paths. Popular lectures were given in various towns and villages on agricultural topics. Grants were made to deserving scholars to enable them to attend classes in other parts of Switzerland or in Germany; and donations were made to various local agricultural exhibitions, and to agricultural institutions not belonging to the canton. The report of the canton for 1892 speaks in high terms of the work of the Economic Society, and bears witness to the complete harmony that exists between the two boards. As a mark of the canton's appreciation of the society's work, its subvention was raised to five thousand francs.

In 1893 the chief work of the cantonal government was the extensive purchase of hay and straw, in order to help the poorer peasants to tide over the bad season. The spring and summer of 1893 were extremely dry, and Switzerland, like many other countries, suffered extremely from want of water. In the canton of Berne the distress caused by the drought, added to that caused by an exceptionally severe frost in May which in many places ruined the fruit trees, was very severely felt, and at the end of the summer it became a question how the peasants would be able to keep their cattle alive during the following winter, the supply of hay being very scanty. There was plenty of hay and maize to be got from abroad, notably from Italy, but as it seemed likely that speculators would be eager to take advantage of the peasants' need, the canton stepped in, and transacted the following extensive purchases on their behalf: 1200 waggon-loads of maize,

costing 1,930,000 frs. ; 500 waggon-loads of hay, costing 400,000 frs. ; 250 waggon-loads of straw, costing 150,000 frs. That is to say, about two and a half million francs were expended. The maize came from Hungary and Roumania, and the hay and straw from Italy.

The loans of hay, etc., were made to the communes, and payment was to be due at the end of 1894. One and a half per cent. was charged to the communes for this loan, and the advantage may be understood by considering what high rates they would have had to pay if they had been forced to negotiate the matter for themselves.

A printed form was sent to the authorities of each commune, who were to find out how much of each article was required by the peasantry of their commune ; and the goods were delivered to the various communes, carriage paid, at the following rates : maize, 16 frs. per 100 kilos ; hay, 14 frs. 50 cents per 100 kilos ; straw, 10 frs. per 100 kilos.

The communal authorities distributed the goods to those who had asked for them, subject to certain regulations, among which were the following :—1. The hay, etc., must be distributed to the poorer peasants as well as to the more solvent. 2. Care is to be taken that the peasants only receive the exact amount they require, so that no traffic may take place with the provender. 3. The communes must sell the provender at the same price as that at which they receive it. 4. The communal authorities must see that the quality of provender is good before they commence to unload it. All complaints must be sent at once by telegraph to Berne, otherwise they cannot receive attention. 5. The communal authorities are to see that the provender is not distributed gratuitously, but only in the shape of a loan, which the farmers are to pay back as soon as they can.

This last rule was most important, as it expressed the intention of the canton only to assist the farmer by a loan. The canton only transacted business with the communes, from whom payment will be required, and not with private individuals, who again are responsible to their respective communes.

The work was carried on as rapidly as possible, and by the end of November the peasants were all able to face the winter with the knowledge that they would be able to feed their cattle.

R. V. MÜLLER-NIXON.

L'ASSOCIATION PROTESTANTE POUR L'ÉTUDE PRATIQUE DES QUESTIONS SOCIALES.¹—If one can at all judge of the strength of French Protestantism by this report, it must be a good deal more

¹ *Travaux du Congrès du Havre.* [272 pp. 8vo. Fischbacher. Paris, 1894.]

vigorous than is ordinarily supposed. The *Association Protestante*, which was founded in 1887 for the study of social questions, something upon the lines of our Christian Social Union, numbered by July, 1893, 583 members, of whom 38 were women, 221 laymen, and 324 pastors. The *Revue du Christianisme Pratique*, which appears once in two months, is a kind of unofficial organ of the Association; and it is evident that French Protestantism, like English Nonconformity, is laying increasing stress upon the social side of Christianity. At Havre and at Nimes, *cercles populaires* have been established in working-class districts for the discussion of social questions;¹ while efforts are being made in Paris to bring the students and workpeople into closer touch with one another. There has been a marked development of late in the economic thought of the Protestant pastors; one of them declares that Land Nationalization is "nothing but the modern translation of the agrarian law of the Mosaic Code, according to which God, the only true proprietor of the Holy Land, assigned, as it were, to each Israelitish family its portion of the common heritage;"² while another describes himself as a "liberal socialist."³ The President, M. de Boyve, declares himself in favour of Co-operation, including under this word co-partnership in profits,⁴ though perhaps not in management; and this seems to express the view of the majority of the members.

The line adopted by the Protestants differs considerably in method from that taken by Catholic social reformers. The Protestants are principally concerned with establishing a strong public opinion upon the points at issue, and have made little attempt to organize themselves as a body of men with definite political views—a policy which has been rendered necessary in the case of the Catholics by the persecution which has fallen so heavily upon them during the last twenty years. That section of the Catholic party of which the Comte de Mun is the leader, is generally regarded as distinctly socialistic,⁵ and it may therefore be of interest to notice the speech recently delivered by him at Saint-Brieuc, in which he expressly disavows any sympathy with Socialism. This disavowal is explained by the meaning which the word Socialism ordinarily bears on the continent. "Socialism," says the Count, "in the common sense of the word, that is to say revolutionary Socialism, is first of all a materialistic doctrine which denies the Divine law, and which has for its exclusive object the satisfaction

¹ *Travaux*, p. 31.² *Ibid.*, p. 64.³ *Ibid.*, p. 5.⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 23.⁵ *E.g.* "Je laisserai de côté le socialisme de M. de Mun et de Léon XIII. lui-même" (Extract from a speech by M. Babut, quoted in *Travaux*, p. 41).

of material appetites." ¹ It is with reference to this kind of Socialism that the Pope has said, "To declare one's self a Catholic Socialist is as absurd as to call one's self a materialist-spiritualist, or an atheist-theist." ² With much that in England would be regarded as socialistic, both the Pope and the Comte de Mun are in hearty sympathy.

E. R. YOUNGHUSBAND.

THE LONDON CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION BOARD has recently published its *Third Annual Report*, the tenor of which is in every way gratifying and encouraging. Whatever misgivings may have been entertained at the time of its foundation, the Board has by its actions amply justified the wisdom of its creation. Not only by direct intervention, but also by indirect influence, it has helped to smooth the relations between masters and men. Eight cases are especially noticed, in which it has either offered or actually given its services during the past year. Perhaps the most interesting one is that of Messrs. Francis & Co., and the Society of Watermen and Lightermen. The question was the reconsideration of the rate of wages formerly fixed, and the award reduced that rate. The case showed "that it is possible for the Board's methods to provide effectually in cases where wages are reduced, as well as where an increase is granted."

Not in every instance has success crowned the Board's efforts. The knottiest difficulty of all seems to be the determination of the precise kinds of work to be done by two different classes of labourers, who are engaged in much the same operation. Twice during 1893, once in the case of the Plasterers, and once with the Bricklayers and Tilers, did the Board fail to give a decision that was accepted. Yet, in spite of this, the tone of the Report is hopeful; the progress of the conciliation movement is described as having been "continuous and encouraging," and a number of similar bodies to the London Board have been instituted in different parts of the country.

The events of the past year, notably the extensive coal strike, which was in part due to a misunderstanding between miners and their employers, have increased the feeling in favour of conciliation and arbitration. Hence more than usual interest attaches to the Bill, which is printed in the appendix to the Report. Its object and scope is to confer on Boards of Conciliation additional powers, which experience has proved that they need if they are to be made thoroughly efficient. The Bill was introduced under the auspices of the London Board last session, but was crowded out by Government business; its prospects in the session just commenced are scarcely more promising.

¹ *Association Catholique*, Jan. 1894, p. 10.

² *Ibid.*, p. 80.

It gives a recognized and quasi-legal status to Conciliation Boards, consisting of an equal number of representatives of employers and employed, by enabling them to get registered under certain conditions at the Board of Trade. An industrial dispute may be settled by conciliation, or quiet discussion between the rival parties in the presence of representatives of the Conciliation Board. If that course proves ineffectual, arbitration may then be resorted to, if the opponents express their assent thereto in writing; and if the arbitration proceedings drag on without result, the Board of Trade may be appealed to, to appoint an umpire to adjudicate on the case. The novel points in the Bill are the governmental recognition to be extended to Conciliation Boards; the power of such Boards, or of arbitrators selected by them, to compel the attendance of witnesses, and to examine witnesses on oath and prosecute them for perjury; and the legal validity of the awards in certain cases and under certain conditions. Moreover, in a new clause investing the arbitrators with power to insure the termination or extension of any award at a given date to be determined by such award, there is a glimpse of permanency; the institution may in time become permanent, and acquire a more or less absolute authority in determining wages. But such a contingency seems yet well in the future.

The Bill is not free from defects; on several important points it is vague and uncertain, and, as drafted, it is likely to lead to expensive litigation and appeals to the High Court. But when the frightful waste of our "industrial wars" is considered—a waste all the more serious in view of increasing foreign competition—one cannot help feeling that it is a step in the right direction.

G. W. POWERS.

TRADE COUNCILS.—A Bill to make provision for the establishment of Trade Councils was prepared and brought in during last session by Mr. Bousfield, Conservative member for North Hackney, and by Sir A. Scoble, Mr. Stewart Wallace, and Mr. Whiteley, also Metropolitan members. The scope and importance of the proposals therein contained are worth briefly pointing out.

The root-idea seems to be derived from existing trade-unions on the one side, and from the recently established Coal Conference on the other. The aim is to unite employers and workmen into one union in each trade: as the first section puts it, "A trade Society may be formed under this Act for any trade, consisting of employers in the trade and workmen in the employment of such employers, with District Councils, Provincial Councils, and a Grand Council as

hereinafter provided." We may take a case to illustrate how this gradation of councils would presumably work out. Let it be the iron trade. Here Swansea would have to have a District Council, the South Wales and the Cleveland industries separate Provincial Councils, while the Grand Council would represent the whole iron-working trade of the kingdom.

Membership of these societies is to be strictly voluntary *at first*, but after a time State interference is to assist. Section 5 is most important from its statement of this principle: "In any district all the employers in the trade who may consent thereto, and all the workmen in their employment who may consent thereto, shall be members of the Society until such time as the number of members of the Society within the district shall amount to five-sixths of the total number of employers and workmen in the trade within the district, from which time membership of the society shall become compulsory upon all employers in the trade within the district and all workmen in their employment." This is the organization of labour with a vengeance, and the language is plain save for an ambiguity, which would be better cleared up, in the words "five-sixths of the total number of employers and workmen." Presumably five-sixths of the employers and five-sixths of the workmen are intended, not five-sixths of them classed together.

The method of establishing these Councils and of the election of members need hardly be detailed. The principle at the basis seems to be the equal representation of employers and employed. This reminds us of the Coal Conference, as does the provision in Section 2, that to such representatives "may be added one other person, who may be chosen by such representatives." As to the constitution of the Councils, it may finally be remarked that representatives from the District Councils form the Provincial Councils, and so from the Provincial representatives we get the Grand Council.

The work the Councils are to perform is of great importance, and of course that of the Grand Council is most important of all. It is the general legislative body for the trade. Its work is two-sided. We may call these sides, Trade-union and arbitration work on the one hand, and Benefit-society work on the other. The Council may be differently constituted, according as it is concerned with the first of these duties or the second.

Under the first head come the settlement of trade disputes—and this, we may remark, involves the regulation of the rate of wages,—the regulation of the hours of labour, of the admission of apprentices, of relief for the unemployed, and so on.

Under the second, come the formation and administration of funds to compensate for injuries, to provide for sickness, and to give pensions in old age. Here the principle, wisely adopted, we think, is in direct opposition to the extreme position adopted by the Government as to "contracting out." The trade society seems the proper machinery for administering such funds, whether for pensions or compensation. The German system of the collection of contributions through the employer is adopted in the Bill, and there is a provision for contributions from the Board of Guardians to aid the trade society in supporting the sick or aged, whom otherwise the rates would have entirely to maintain.

This is a brief account of a Bill which is itself brief. The revolutionary proposals that have been set forth are contained within six pages. It may be asked, What is their significance? It may be conceded at once that the Bill will never pass. Before this appears in print the ballot may have excluded it from the list for this session. If its introducers are fortunate in the ballot, the Government programme for the session seems likely to allow a minimum of time to private members and their cherished bills. But the fact that such a proposal should be introduced at all is of the first importance. Moreover, we cannot but regard the proposals themselves as of considerable value. Criticism of them is no doubt possible and desirable, but they seem to effectively sum up the drift of events, and to point out the line of least resistance which the organization of industry can take. We must, however, have our eyes open and see where we are going. The Bill admits State Interference and Compulsion into the plan. Its proposers are probably aware that it involves ultimately much more than the amount they prescribe. For it is obvious that, if each Grand Council regulates the affairs of its own trade, we should need some power to regulate the relations of one trade to all the rest. The Grand Council of the Coal Trade might fix such rates of remuneration and such hours of labour as would involve the absorption by its members of an undue share of the National Dividend. This question of ultimate State control would of necessity arise, but only after the trades were individually organized; and that the proposal under examination does not attempt either to exhaust a great subject, or to determine the end of a movement which is just beginning, is not a defect but a merit.

A. A. ROCHE.

LEGISLATION, PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES, AND OFFICIAL RETURNS.

THE *Savings Bank Act*, 1893 (56 and 57 Vict., chap. 69, 4to, 6 pp., 1*d.*), raises the amount which a depositor may place in a savings bank in one year from £30 to £50, and the amount of government stock which he may buy in a year from £100 to £200, and the aggregate amount of stock which he may hold at one time from £200 to £500.

The *Shop Hours Act*, 1893 (56 and 57 Vict., chap. 67, 4to, 2 pp., ½*d.*), is a short amending act providing for expenses incurred under the Shop Hours Act, 1892.

The *Local Government Act*, 1894 (56 and 57 Vict., chap. 73, 4to, 72 pp., 9½*d.*, postage 1½*d.*), is the fifth great nineteenth-century act creating or reconstituting on a uniform basis those institutions of local self-government which we are perhaps a little inclined to regard as possessing a more hoary antiquity than they can really claim. The first of the five was the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834, to which we owe the unions and boards of guardians ; the second was the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835, which gave the city and borough councils their present form ; the third was the Public Health Act of 1875, passed in the palmy days of *Sanitas sanitatum omnia sanitas*, to which the urban and rural "sanitary districts" and "sanitary authorities" owe their being ; the fourth was the Local Government Act of 1888, which established county councils. The Act of 1894 completes the main structure by the creation of parish meetings and councils in the rural districts.

Part I. of the act provides that every rural parish—that is to say, every civil parish or part of a civil parish at present in a rural sanitary district—shall have a "parish meeting," and every rural parish with a population of three hundred or more is to have a "parish council." Rural parishes with a population between one hundred and three hundred may require the county council to give them a council, and the county council may, if it pleases, and obtains the consent of the parish meeting, establish a council in still smaller parishes. Every one who possesses either the parliamentary or the county council franchise is a "parochial elector," and entitled to take part in the parish meeting. To be qualified for election as a councillor, a man or woman (whether

spinster, widow, or wife) must either be a parochial elector, or have resided for twelve months in the parish or within three miles of it. The council will take over all the civil duties of the vestry and churchwardens, and will be the authority charged with carrying out the Lighting and Watching Act, the Baths and Washhouses Act, the Burial Acts, the Public Improvement Act, and the Public Libraries Acts, whenever any of them have been adopted by the parish meeting. It is given power to provide parish buildings, recreation grounds, and public walks. It may also improve the water-supply where this can be done without interference with vested interests, drain stagnant ponds, acquire rights of way, and maintain footpaths which are not alongside public roads. Its sanction will be required for the stoppage of either roads or rights of way. It is not, however, allowed to borrow money without the consent both of the parish meeting and of the county council, and the total amount borrowed must in no case exceed half the assessable value of the parish. It may not incur expenditure involving more than a threepenny rate without the consent of the meeting, nor more than a sixpenny rate in any case, except so far as expenditure under the Lighting and Watching and the other "adoptive" acts is concerned. In the small parishes which have no council, the parish meeting will possess a large portion of these powers, and the county council may confer the rest.

Part II. of the act is commonly said to establish district councils, but in this way of putting the matter the fact is overlooked that district councils already exist in the shape of town councils, local boards, improvement commissioners, and boards of guardians in their capacity of rural sanitary authority. The act does not touch the town councils, and it remodels and renames rather than abolishes the other three kinds of authority. The local boards and improvement commissioners, rechristened "urban district councils," will be elected by the parliamentary and county council electors on the principle of one man one vote, instead of by the owners and ratepayers with a number of votes varying with the magnitude of the qualification. Any one, man or woman, spinster, widow, or wife, who either is an elector or has resided in the district for twelve months, will be qualified to serve. The term of office remains unaltered, except that the county and district council may agree to let the whole of the councillors retire triennially instead of one-third retiring annually. London vestries and boards of works come under the same regulations.

In the existing rural sanitary districts, which are the poor-law unions with the urban parts left out, the guardians are at present the "rural sanitary authority" as a body or board, although the guardians

for entirely urban parishes are excluded. Under the act the board of guardians will in no way be identified with the district council, but every person who represents a rural parish as guardian will also represent it as a district councillor. The electors, method of election, and qualification will be almost exactly the same, *mutatis mutandis*, in the case of the rural district council as in that of the urban district council. As the rural district councillors and the guardians for rural parishes are the same persons, this abolishes the whole existing system of election in the case of the rural guardians ; and the act does not halt here, but abolishes the existing system everywhere. There are to be no more *ex-officio* guardians (except certain aldermen in the Oxford Union), the electors are to be the parliamentary and county council voters, and the qualification is to be an elector or to have resided twelve months in the union. Sex and marriage are not to constitute disqualifications. A chairman and vice-chairman and two other members may be co-opted.

The rural district councils will take over all the powers of the existing rural sanitary authorities and highway authorities. They are also granted some new powers, the most important of which relate to the maintenance of rights of way, commons, and roadside wastes.

An important part of the act is the clause which deals with areas and boundaries. The existing urban sanitary districts will become the future urban districts without alteration. The cases where they were divided between two counties have already been dealt with by the Local Government Act of 1888, so that every one of them is now solely within the territory of a single county council. But the rural parishes and rural sanitary districts will often be altered. Some of the parishes and districts as defined by the act will be absurdly small. There are at present eleven parishes which contain no population, and the number will be largely increased by the fact that section i. of the act divides every parish which is partly in an urban sanitary district and partly in a rural sanitary district, into two parishes. There are also rural sanitary districts of Liliputian proportions. The rural sanitary district of Ipswich, for example, covers 963 acres, and has a population of 226. The county councils are ordered to deal with such areas by annexation, and also to arrange matters so that no parish shall be in more than one county, and, unless for "special reasons," that no parish shall be in more than one district and no district in more than one county. As it is not provided that the unions must be altered at the same time as the rural districts, it seems that the rural parts of unions and the rural districts will no longer be always conterminous as at present, and thus there will be introduced a new kind of overlapping, which will be very inconvenient in some cases, as the rural

guardians and district councillors are the same persons. The guardians' meeting for the unions X and Y must be held on different days from the district council meetings, because parish A is in union X and district Y, and its representative cannot be in two places at once. This fact and others rather suggest that the authors of the bill do not regard the union as a permanent institution, but expect to see the workhouses handed over to the counties, and the administration of outdoor relief entrusted to the district councils, urban as well as rural.

The first elections under the act are to take place on November 8th, or some later day in the present year if the Local Government Board see fit.

The Labour Commission has issued—

Appendix to the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Commission sitting as a whole (C. 7063, fol., 366 pp., 3s. 1d., postage 6d.).

Indexes—vol. ii.: Trades, part ii., Group B (C. 7063—v., A, fol., 95 pp., 9d., postage 2½d.).

Indexes—vol. iii.: Trades, part iii., Group C (C. 7063—v., B, fol., 96 pp., 9d., postage 2½d.).

The Agricultural Labourer—

Vol. i., England: Indexes (C. 6894—xiii., fol., 87 pp., 8½d., postage 2½d.).

Vol. iii., Scotland: part ii., Reports by Messrs Pringle and Wilkinson (C. 6894—xvi., fol., 215 pp., 1s. 9d., postage 4½d.).

Vol. iii., Scotland: Indexes (C. 6894—xvii., fol., 37 pp., 4d., postage 1½d.).

Vol. iv., Ireland: part iv., Reports by Mr. Wilson Fox (C. 6894—xxi., fol., 142 pp., 1s. 2d., postage 3d.).

Foreign Reports—

Vol. v., Germany (C. 7063—vii., fol., 110 pp., 1s. 1d., postage 3d.).

Vol. vi., France (C. 7063—ix., fol., 143 pp., 2s. 1d., postage 4½d.).

Vol. vii., Switzerland (C. 7063—x., fol., 48 pp., 5d., postage 1½d.).

The grand total of pages issued by the Commission now amounts to 13,305; but the flood shows signs of abatement, as the number for the last three months is only 1339. The Report for Germany gives a table showing the migration of population in Germany for 1886–90, which it is interesting to compare with the 1881–90 figures for England which were given in this *Review* last October. The net loss by migration, or excess of emigrants over immigrants, in the whole country amounted to 331,196. The text of the report most inexplicably treats this number as if it were the gross emigration, although an earlier table states the gross transoceanic emigration alone to have amounted to 485,129, and although the 331,196 is obviously obtained by subtracting the actual increase, 2,570,680, from the natural increase, 2,901,876.

Into Berlin and Potsdam the net immigration was 290,155 in the five years 1886-90, as against 160,000 or 170,000 into London and all her suburbs in the ten years 1881-90.

The publication of the results of the 1891 census of England and Wales concludes with vol. iv., which contains the *General Report* (Command Paper 7222, fol., 143 pp., 1s. 3d., postage 3d.), and an unnumbered volume entitled *Index to the Population Tables* (C. 7216 fol., 218 pp., 1s. 9d., postage 4½d.). Perhaps the most important item in vol. iv. is Appendix B, three pages which show in what respects the classification of occupations in the census of 1891 differs from that adopted in the publication of the results of the census of 1881. Without this before him, the inquirer will be liable to fall into the most serious error. He will be apt, for example, to hunt for some very recondite explanation of the rise of the number of men returned as "engaged in gardens" from 70,539 in 1881 to 174,290, while the fact is that it is chiefly due to the transference of "domestic gardeners," who numbered 74,603, in 1881 from the "domestic class" to the "agricultural class." He may perhaps base an attack on railway rates on the enormous increase of men "engaged in the conveyance of men, goods, and messages on roads" from 165,854 to 365,015, through ignorance of the fact that this class in 1891 includes grooms, horse-keepers, and horsebreakers, who to the number of 40,819 were agricultural persons "engaged about animals" in 1881, and also domestic coachmen and domestic grooms, who to the number of 73,167 were then "persons engaged in domestic offices and services." For these particular changes there is a good deal to be said, but many others have been made which are scarcely defensible. The slight improvements which they introduce do not outweigh the disadvantage incurred in making comparisons between census and census more difficult.

Even apart from alterations in the classification, such comparisons are difficult enough, and often lead into perfect quagmires of uncertainty. Take, for instance, the case of the seamstresses. These, together with the female shirtmakers, were returned at 81,865 in 1881, and only 52,943 in 1891. Here is what seems to be a quite important decline; but there are many things to be considered before we can simply accept the figures. The General Report points out that there was an increase in the number of women returned as "machinists," from 7524 in 1881, to 21,478 in 1891, which may explain away a part of the decline; "but even when the seamstresses and the machinists are put together, there is found to have been a decline among them of over 17 per cent. The natural and probable explanation is that one sewing machinist can replace several

hand-sewers." Hereupon the superficial theorist goes away rejoicing at a diminution of 17 per cent. in an irksome kind of labour effected by machinery. The statistician, however, lingering fondly over the figures, notices an enormous apparent increase of tailoresses, from 52,980 in 1881 to 89,224, and it strikes him as highly probable that a number of women who would have called themselves seamstresses in 1881, called themselves tailoresses in 1891. Adding the three sets of figures together, he gets the following results : seamstresses, tailoresses, female shirtmakers and machinists, in 1881, 142,369, and in 1891, 163,645. It now appears that the decline of seamstresses is accompanied by an increase in the number of women engaged in sewing, and the next question seems to be—How far is the conversion of seamstresses into tailoresses due to economic causes—a change in the kind of work or conditions under which it is carried on? and how far is it due to what may be called philological causes—to the fact that the terms "seamstress" and "needlewoman" are from other than economic causes becoming archaic?

Before attempting to consider this question, the statistician examines the General Report of the census of 1881, and finds that the present Registrar-General and Dr. Ogle, who sign the 1891 Report, were then of opinion that the smallness of the increase of seamstresses between 1871 and 1881 was perhaps partly due not only to the conversion of seamstresses into tailoresses, but also to their conversion into "milliners' assistants." Now the milliners' assistants are combined with the milliners, dressmakers, and staymakers, who, of course, include an army of shopwomen in addition to sewing-women, and the whole class is numerous enough to completely swamp the seamstresses and tailoresses, as it numbered 357,995 in 1881, and 415,961 in 1891. At this point the statistician retires in despair, declaring that nothing can be discovered.

The following table gives some of the main and most trustworthy results of the census of occupations :—

Men and Women engaged in	1881.	1891.	Increase or decrease per cent.
Agricultural labour and shepherding ..	870,798	780,707	— 10·3
Mining ..	437,670	555,617	+ 26·9
Transport (road, rail, and inland water) ..	282,391	366,201	+ 29·7
Building ..	666,738	680,886	+ 2·1
Cotton, flax, and linen manufacture ..	582,916	633,370	+ 8·7
Woollen manufacture ..	227,643	250,353	+ 10
Workers and dealers in dress ..	1,056,058	1,202,992	+ 13·9
Commerce ..	816,865	416,365	+ 31·4
Domestic servants (excluding hotels) ..	1,286,668	1,444,694	+ 12·2

The various movements of different branches of women's employment shown by the census are collected together in an ingenious table in the February *Labour Gazette*. They are scarcely so large and important as most people would expect, and it would not be difficult to explain away the largest of them.

The figures with regard to the numbers of employers and employed, which were collected in 1891 for the first time, are regarded by the Registrar-General and his assistants as very untrustworthy. They may be so, but the chief reasons given for believing them to be so will not hold water for a moment. One of these reasons is that some people, instead of returning themselves either as employers or as employed, or as working on their own account, returned themselves under two, or even under all three, of these descriptions. Why not? Many persons shift periodically from "working on their own account," to being either employed or employers, and many employed persons are at the same time employers. The other reason is, that in the case of some trades the number of persons returning themselves as employers is actually greater than the number returned as employed. This occurs, it is remarked, in the case of "builders, provision dealers, coal dealers, road contractors, dealers in hemp, etc., dealers in cane, rush, etc." *Aliquando dormitat registrarius*. To the ordinary mind it appears surprising, not that the employer builders and road contractors should exceed the employed builders and road contractors, but that there should be any employed builders and road contractors at all. Obviously the reason why the employers exceed the employed under these and similar headings is that the persons employed are returned under other headings. A builder does not employ other builders, but masons and plasterers. A coal dealer employs coal porters and carters, and so on. The employed "builders" are presumably persons who gave themselves descriptions such as "builder's foreman" or "builder's manager."

Much of the very interesting matter contained in the General Report has been already dealt with in notices of the Preliminary Report, and the first three volumes of the census. With regard to the growth of different classes of towns, the extremely misleading figures of the Preliminary Report, based on the urban sanitary district boundaries, are simply repeated; but a new table, giving the aggregate population of one hundred and thirty-seven registration districts which contained no urban sanitary districts, makes its appearance. The aggregate population of these districts, the fluctuations of which, in all probability, may be taken to represent very fairly the fluctuations of the population of the whole purely rural area of England and

Wales, has remained almost exactly stationary since 1851. It was 1,693,999, 1,712,119, 1,724,486, 1,717,336, and 1,718,137 at the last five censuses. Any one who has lately travelled much over the roads of England would be surprised if any other result had been shown. The density of population in England and Wales is four hundred and ninety-seven persons per square mile, and if we all kept our proper distances from each other, we should be planted out with eighty-five yards between each person and his next neighbours. Overcrowding, as measured by the somewhat arbitrary standard of percentage of total population living more than two in a room in tenements containing less than five rooms, varies extraordinarily from place to place. In Northumberland it is 38·69, and in Hampshire 2·58 ; in Gateshead it is 40·78, and in Portsmouth 1·74. There appears to be a certain general rise in the proportion from south to north, and this may be due to different household arrangements, or a different method of reckoning rooms, which does not correspond with a real difference in overcrowding ; but there are surprising differences between different towns in the same district which cannot be due to any such cause. In Bradford the proportion is 20·61 ; in Leeds, 16·46 ; in Sheffield, 11·58 ; in Hull, 7·86. Plymouth, with 26·27, presents an extraordinary contrast with Portsmouth. The compilers of the report can see nothing in the data supplied by the census which throws any light on these differences. They possibly have not compared the figures for overcrowding with the numbers of uninhabited houses. In Gateshead, with 40·78 per cent. of overcrowding, there is one uninhabited house to every 506 persons ; in Portsmouth, with 1·74 per cent. of overcrowding, there is one to every 51 persons, and, speaking very roughly, the proportions seem to vary inversely throughout. On *à priori* grounds we should naturally expect the proportion of genuine overcrowding to vary with the difficulty of procuring a house, which difficulty, in its turn, probably varies chiefly with the conformation of the ground on which the town is situated, and the value of the surrounding land for other than building purposes. A curious table on p. 25 shows that women's mendacity about their ages has steadily diminished since 1841. It was then represented by the figure 7·2 per cent., and has now fallen to 4·9, if the life-tables are to be trusted. On pp. 34, 35 there is an attempt to throw light on a question discussed by Mr. Lyttleton and Mr. Inge in the *Economic Review* for July, 1892, and January, 1893—the comparative longevity of single and married persons. The table, however, seems to be based on the assumption that the proportion of persons born who will marry at some time during their lives remains always the same in successive decades,

and also on the assumption that the proportions in which emigrants are divided between married and single persons does not change. It can scarcely, therefore, be regarded as conclusive.

The apparent decrease in the number of British subjects born abroad, from 56,373 in 1881 to 34,895 in 1891, which was remarked on as incredible in January, is easily explained. In the previous censuses, all persons born abroad who appeared to the enumerating clerks to have distinctly English surnames, were reckoned as British subjects, whether they returned themselves as such or not. In the 1891 census this practice, of which no warning ever seems to have been given, was very properly abandoned. The 1891 census number of British subjects born abroad is consequently less than the real number, as there is a doubt that many natives of foreign parts who are British subjects, either by parentage or naturalization, omit to write the words "British subject" after their birthplace. The number of foreign subjects in the country is consequently overstated. At previous censuses, on the contrary, it is probable that the number of foreigners was understated, and the number of British subjects born abroad overstated, as "distinctly English" names are very common not only among Scandinavians and Germans, but even, as will be seen presently, among Russians.

The *Return showing the names of all aliens to whom certificates of naturalization have been issued, from August 1, 1892, to July 31, 1893* (House of Commons Paper, 1893, No. 425, fol., 10 pp., 1½d.), contains 419 names. The Germans numbered 164, the Russians 131, the Austrians and Hungarians 29, the French 16, the Turks 13, the Swiss and Dutch 10 each. No other nation contributed more than 8. The list of 131 Russians includes a great many English or Anglicized names: Baker, Baron, Black (twice), Bradlaw, Braidman, Cowen, Davidson, Dickson, Eddlestone, Ellison, Frost, Goldson, Goodman, Greenfield, Harris, Lewis, Lipkin, Miller, Millner, Morris, (five times), Newman, Phillips, Rush, Silverman, Stone, Swift, Watchman, Wharman,—all occur, to say nothing of distinctly Hebrew names, which we scarcely regard as foreign—Cohou, Davids, Isaacson, Josephs, Levitt (four times), and Levy (four times).

The December *Return of the number of aliens that arrived from the continent at ports in the United Kingdom* (House of Commons Paper, 1893-4, No. 35—xi., fol., 1 p., ½d.) shows a decrease of 13,659 in the total for the year 1893 as compared with that for 1892; but rather more than the whole of this decrease is due to a diminution of 14,381 in the number who were declared to be on their way to America.

EDWIN CANNAN.

REVIEWS.

A TREATISE ON MONEY, AND ESSAYS ON MONETARY PROBLEMS. By J. SHIELD NICHOLSON, M.A., D.Sc., Professor of Political Economy in the University of Edinburgh. [xvi., 415 pp. 8vo. 7s. 6d. Black. London, 1893.]

In view, partly, of current controversy Professor Nicholson has reprinted his work on Money, and has added to it various essays published in the interval which has elapsed since the appearance of the first edition. The several essays which it contains hang together more than is commonly the case with volumes of the kind. We have, first of all, an admirable statement of general principles, a lucid and orderly setting forth of current theories and historical views of currency. We have next an object-lesson in many of the points involved, which may be described as a sermon on the text of the life of John Law, of Laurieston, the celebrated Scotsman, who skimmed like a stormy petrel over the waters of eighteenth-century finance in France. The practical application, so to speak, comes in the concluding essays, in which Professor Nicholson appears as an advocate of bimetallism, a position which has been forced upon him by the conclusions he reached in his philosophical considerations on the subject. It is, perhaps, matter for regret that two essays have been inserted on the Living Capital of the United Kingdom, and the relations of Capital and Labour; for the conclusions embodied are not justified by the same careful statement of principles as the teachings on currency, and, since the essays themselves stand rather outside the subject of this volume, they spoil its coherence. It is superfluous to say that, throughout, Professor Nicholson writes with a mastery of facts and of style. He is never diffuse and never pedantic; his conclusions, right or wrong, are made available to all, and the grounds on which they are based are put within the grasp of the least instructed reader.

As the keynote of the whole volume is an apologia for bimetallism, it is to this point that I address myself. On most questions connected with this thorny subject, Professor Nicholson is convincing. No one ought, after reading his book, to doubt the honesty of the proposal, or to regard Mr. Giffen as a consistent, or, what is more important,

as a convincing reasoner. No one, again, ought to be in doubt as to some of the results which will follow if bimetallism is established on a large scale. That prices will be more stable ; that trade between gold- and silver-using countries will be greatly facilitated ; that industry will be, for a time at any rate, greatly stimulated—these points may be taken as agreed between disputants. I prefer to adopt a somewhat ungracious attitude of doubt on points which, it seems to me, Professor Nicholson has not enforced so successfully, and on which conviction may still be wanting to many as it is to myself.

First of all, then, as to the needs of the hour. The present state of things, and its inconveniences in particular, are ascribed in this volume very largely to monometallism, scarcity of gold, and consequent low prices. The position, it seems to me, needs a good deal more of demonstration than Professor Nicholson gives to it. His remarks on the effects of diminished cost of production, and the smallness of its results, are not sufficient to convince one who is fresh from Mr. Wells's *Recent Economic Changes*. It may be, and there is a great deal to be said on grounds of historical analogy, that cost of production is a "negligeable quantity." No doubt the gold discoveries of forty years ago did work changes of a kind which justify the hypothesis that the effects we see now are due to causes *ejusdem generis*. But here the question insinuates itself : Are the phenomena themselves of precisely the same kind ? It does not follow that depression is exactly the opposite of prosperity ; the terms are used so loosely, and in one case a class may be prominent which is out of sight in the other. For instance, the prosperity of the period to which reference is made may be largely in the matter of profits, and also wages, but the depression may be comparatively confined to profits. It would require a vast amount of comparative research to demonstrate either side of the question ; but all I wish to emphasize is, that it does not follow as a matter of reasoning that because prosperity went hand in hand with an addition to our supplies of gold, therefore depression necessarily implies a contraction of the same supplies, and can be remedied by monetizing silver. It may be so, but it is not proved as yet ; and the comparative prosperity even now of the working class suggests a doubt whether it is so.

To take another point in the same connection, I am not wholly satisfied with Professor Nicholson's demonstration of the cause of the fall in prices. This may be due to an appreciation of gold, but surely the professor attaches far too little weight to cost of production. No doubt it is, in a measure, true that cost of production only determines relative prices, and that if you can show a universal fall, you must

attribute it to movement upwards in the measure of value. But what an "if" this is! How much is implied by the phrase "universal fall"! and how far we are from a sufficiency of evidence to establish it! Take, for example, the Indian problem. Has silver fallen, or has gold risen, or both? If silver alone has fallen, then why are prices in India so little mobile? If gold alone has risen, why the difficulties of trade between the two countries, and the outcries of remitting civilians? Why does not the smaller amount of gold which they receive for their rupees buy them as many commodities as ever? Yet, hint this to an Indian official, and he is as savage as a man robbed of a grievance, and language can go no further.

Once more. In a different part of the subject, viz. the possibility of bimetallism, Professor Nicholson appears to me to make far too light of a difficulty—I mean the possibility that, do what you will, the increased output of silver may drive gold out of circulation. His answer is the retort: Where is it to go to? This is all very well as a retort, but it is not conclusive. Granting the occasion, and he would be a bold man who would limit our powers of consuming gold. There are a thousand and one uses for gold which nothing but the high value, maintained largely by the demand for currency, prevents us from adopting. Its attraction for the female and even the male part of a modern people is irresistible, and shows no sign of weakening, and this attraction is independent of its high value. I do not dwell upon the future of human teeth, and my own dentist is a bimetallist, but here we have a growing demand, and when we reflect upon the qualities of gold, there must be an enormous number of occasions on which its use would become common. It may be that these would not be sufficient to absorb it; but it is, surely, very rash to assume as the basis of an argument that they would not.

In conclusion, let me suggest two further points, on which I venture to think it would be well for Professor Nicholson to add essays in a third edition, even if he were compelled to omit those which are not germane to the currency problem. First, what would be the effect of bimetallism on the volume of English imports? Would it stay their growth or even diminish them? and, if so, what would be the general result to ourselves? Secondly, are the bimetallists prepared to say that the adoption of a double standard would not produce very disastrous consequences to the working class? It would raise prices—this is in the forefront of the programme. Would there not be an interval, and, if so, how long, before wages adapted themselves to the new prices? No one has shown better than Professor Nicholson the effects of currency changes on the standard of living among the

working class. Such effects are no doubt temporary—although the professor pokes fun at the economists' use of "ultimately,"—but are they not disastrous, whilst they last? and have we any guarantee that they would not follow on the trail of the bimetallic experiment? If Professor Nicholson would deal with these points, he would do much to satisfy many who are in some perplexity as to practice, and whom he has helped so much on points of theory.

L. R. PHELPS.

THE INDUSTRIES OF RUSSIA. Vols. I. and II.—Manufactures and Trade. Vol. V.—Siberia and the Great Siberian Railway. Issued by the Manufactures and Trade Department of the Ministry of Finance, St. Petersburg, 1893. [Roy. 8vo. Vols. I. and II., iv., 576 pp. 12s. Vol. V., xii., 265 pp. 6s. P. S. King and Son. London, 1893.]

These volumes were prepared for the Chicago Exhibition. The Russian Minister of Finance, feeling that the Russian exhibits could not "convey an adequate idea of the productive forces of the empire and its industrial development," instructed the Department of Trade and Manufactures "to make a general review of the principal branches of the most developed industries of Russia, and of the internal and foreign trade as well as of the customs policy." This took place at the end of 1892, so that the time was short, and Vols. III. and IV., which deal with Agriculture and Forestry, Mining and Metallurgy, were certainly not ready for the exhibition, as they have not yet reached us. Considering that the work had to be written in Russian, and then translated into English and printed by Russian printers, the volumes before us were executed with a rapidity which our Board of Trade and Stationery Office are not at all likely to surpass. The United States Consul-General to Russia, Mr. J. M. Crawford, apologizes handsomely for the faults of the English translation, which he himself supervised; but so far as it is possible to judge without the Russian edition and a knowledge of the Russian tongue, the translation is little if at all below the standard which unfortunately prevails in regard to books of this class. The frequent misprints must be excused, as they are obviously due to the want of an English press reader. In the matter of spelling, the "special request"—presumably of the Russian Government—has caused a delicate attention to be paid to the susceptibilities of the more fastidious of British readers. Words like "labour" and "centre" are spelt "according," as Mr. Crawford puts it, "to the so-called English orthography."

Vols. I. and II., which, so far as the binding and the numbering

of the chapters and pages are concerned, form but one volume, contain many interesting details about particular trades and manufactures, but in the main they may be regarded as a history of the measures taken by the Russian Government to promote manufactures, and in these measures protection plays a very large part.

The crude protectionism which, by a curious confusion of thought, practically leads its votaries to wish for an indefinite increase of exports to be paid for in nothing but gold, is almost a thing of the past so far as educated circles are concerned. The educated protectionist of the present day recognizes that if he gets rid of a portion of the imports by restrictive measures, he will also at the same time get rid of a portion of the exports, though he is not likely to be very candid on the subject when addressing people who are interested in the export trade. What he really desires to do is to diminish the foreign trade—both imports and exports—by transplanting industries from the foreign countries with which the trade is carried on to his own. The British protectionist desires to see grain grown in Lincolnshire rather than in Dakota, and he is ready to face the fact that if grain for Yorkshire consumption is grown in Lincolnshire instead of in Dakota, less Yorkshire manufactures will be exported to Dakota, because he sees that more Yorkshire manufactures will be exported to Lincolnshire. Similarly the American protectionist desires to see more tin-plates made in the United States, and he is ready to face the fact that if fewer tin-plates come from England, less American grain will be exported to pay for them, because he sees that the American tin-plate makers will require to be fed just as much as the English. Now, if the only effect of stopping the exchange of English tin-plates for American grain were that all the English tin-plate makers transferred themselves to American soil, the aggregate production of commodities in America would certainly be greater, though the productiveness of industry or produce per head would be less. And if, on the other hand, the only effect were that Dakotan agriculturists transferred themselves and their industry to Lincolnshire, the aggregate production of commodities in England would certainly be greater, though the produce per head would be less. But the one effect cannot be produced without the other, and so far as both effects are produced, they neutralize each other, and the only result is that each country incurs a loss in produce per head. The population of both countries is already as fully employed as the existing imperfect organization of industry allows, and it will not be increased by restrictions on foreign trade. If there is to be more tin-plate making in the United States there will be less grain-growing in the United

States, and if there is to be more grain-growing in England there will be less tin-plate making in England. There are, of course, American and English protectionists who see this: the Americans fall back on the theory that it is bad for a country to export agricultural products and import manufactured products, and the English fall back on the theory that it is bad for a country to export manufactured products and import agricultural products. The two classes may be left to settle their own differences.

The Russian protectionist, however, occupies far stronger ground than the Anglo-Saxon. The climate of Russia, both in Europe and Asia, is such that agricultural operations are entirely suspended for a large part of the year. During this time, for every thousand able-bodied and able-minded unemployed in England, there are a hundred thousand in Russia. There is good reason to believe that an increase of manufacturing industry would draw largely on this wasted fund of labour, since it is quite possible to carry on manufacturing operations very actively in winter, when labour is plentiful, and slacken the production in summer. The increase of manufacturing industry would therefore not imply an equal diminution of agricultural industry, and the Russian protectionist is quite right in desiring to promote the growth of manufactures. But whether protection is the best means of promoting the growth of manufactures in Russia is quite another question. Many statistics are given in these volumes to show that protective duties have been effectual, but they appear very far from conclusive. They show, what no one ever denied, that a filip may be given to a domestic industry by suddenly subjecting an imported product to a heavier duty, but they do not show that permanent healthy growth is promoted. No sooner has the industry swallowed one dram of protection than it clamours for another. The blessings of protection seem somehow always in the future, and so, though it has reigned in Russia since the beginning of the century, we find Russian administrators now looking forward hopefully to good results from the new tariff of 1891. It seems quite open to any one to contend that all the conscientious labour and pains which have been bestowed on Russia's protective policy for nearly a hundred years have been absolutely wasted, and that manufacturing industry would have grown faster than it has done if all foreign goods had had absolutely free access to Russian markets. Over and over again, the effort to stimulate one industry has had the effect of paralyzing half a dozen. Ignorance, conservatism, and want of capital are probably the chief obstacles to the growth of manufactures in Russia, and protection has no tendency to remove any of the three.

More cheerful reading than Vols. I. and II. is Vol. V., which gives a very interesting account of the prospects of a gigantic undertaking, as to the utility of which there can be very little doubt. That Asia is a large continent must be obvious to every one who has noticed that the map of Asia tucks nearly the whole of Europe into its north-western corner. Siberia is not a sort of arctic Portland Island, but the whole of Asia north of Turkestan and the Chinese empire. It is forty-three times as big as Great Britain and Ireland, and about equal to Europe with Egypt, Algeria, and Morocco, or to British North America with more than a third of the United States and Alaska. In the Altai mountains the Tsar has a private estate eight times as large as Switzerland. Lake Baikal could swallow up the whole of the kingdom of the Netherlands, and would not stick at the Duchy of Luxemburg in addition. The European railway system ends at Tcheliabinsk, at the foot of the Ural, about 2800 miles from Calais. This is the western terminus of the projected Great Siberian Railway; the eastern terminus is at Vladivostok, on the Sea of Japan, 4700 miles away. America will have to take a back seat, for the distance from New York to San Francisco is but 3200 miles, and from Montreal to Vancouver but 2905. At the English rate of a penny a mile, a third-class ticket from Calais to Vladivostok would cost about £31 5s., and at twenty-five miles an hour, including stoppages, a rate which probably could not be attained, the journey would take twelve and a half days. The total capital expenditure on the railway is estimated at 350,000,000 roubles—that is to say, between thirty and forty millions sterling. It seems a large sum, but as the total population of Siberia is about six and a half millions, it will only amount to about £6 per head, while in the United Kingdom the capital invested in railways is between £20 and £25 per head.

At first sight the prospects of obtaining sufficient traffic to make the line remunerative seem rather small. It does not seem likely that the through-passenger traffic from Europe to Vladivostok will be of more than infinitesimal importance, and little is likely to be made out of the carriage of mails now that, under the propaganda of Mr. Henniker Heaton, we have become so penurious of our stamps. As for local traffic, and traffic between the intermediate stations and the two termini, it would seem that the country is far too immense and the population too scattered to be served to any considerable extent by one long line without any feeders. But, as a matter of fact, the railway will have numerous and important feeders from the first. Siberia is traversed by several great rivers with numerous tributaries, most of which are navigable. Navigation is carried on along them already for

thousands of miles, and if it were not for the fact that their mouths are almost continually inaccessible in consequence of their position in the Arctic Ocean, trade between the rest of the world and Siberia would be comparatively active. Now the Great Siberian Railway will cut all these rivers, and, metaphorically speaking, make them flow to Vladivostok on the one side and through Europe on the other. There can be little doubt that when this is done an enormous impulse will be given to the Russian colonization of Siberia. Though the greater portion of the country is unfit for habitation, it contains many regions where tens of millions of men could almost immediately live in better conditions than in European Russia; and when we read of dismal swamps and impenetrable forests, we need only ask ourselves what England and Germany were like in the time of Julius Cæsar.

An interesting question, to which there is no answer, is, How does China regard the project? If, as some tell us, she intends to resist the progress of civilization, she had better make haste, or it will be too late. The railway will curl round her territory in such a way that 2500 miles of it will be within 1500 miles of Pekin.

Whatever influence strategical considerations may have had in determining the Russian Government to undertake the construction of the Siberian Railway, the decision is likely to be favourable to peaceful industrial progress. It marks a step in the inevitable though long-delayed transfer of the energies of governments from the military to the industrial sphere.

Let no one turn to Vol. V. for information about convicts. They are scarcely mentioned, if at all. Vol. I. couples (p. xxii.) "the abolition of the transportation of convicts" with the completion of the Great Siberian Railway, as a future event which will aid the industrial development of Siberia.

EDWIN CANNAN.

PENDANT UNE MISSION EN RUSSIE. Par M. E. FOURNIER DE FLAIX. [Tomes I.-II. 666 pp. 12mo. Guillaumin. Paris, 1894.]

The work of which these two volumes represent the first instalment is the outcome of a "mission of inquiry" undertaken, with official credentials, at his Government's behest, by the well-known editor of the *Économiste Français*, at the time when relations between France and Russia were warming into that demonstrative friendship which is now the talk of the political world. Thus favourably equipped, the experienced economist could not fail to gather up on his way a plentiful harvest of information, which these volumes show that he

well knew how to turn to account—soberly, shrewdly, discriminatingly, from an economic point of view ; although in respect of sentiment his patriotism occasionally leads him astray into rather too magniloquent declamation, and into a decidedly one-sidedly French reading of facts, all which seems calculated rather for the Boulevards than for the study, and was, very probably, resorted to to suit his market.

The writer has taken rather a comprehensive view of his task. The present two volumes do not carry him further than just beyond the Russian border, among those Baltic birches amid which Professor Sayce seeks the cradle of the human race, and those “red-bloused, leather-girdled” *moujiks*, in whom the polite Frenchman, congratulating himself in these very pages on the intellectual superiority of Paris to Berlin, detects his nation’s natural and most congenial allies. The two volumes, bearing the sub-title of *À Travers l’Allemagne*, may be called a record of the remarkable growth of Germany since 1870—growth in population, in wealth, in commerce, in shipping, in political importance. The figures given are very striking, and are rendered not less instructive by the look round which the writer every now and then stops to take of the corresponding movement in other countries—France, England, the United States, Italy—contrasting and drawing comparisons. Very reasonably—and warningly to his own nation—the author enumerates among the sources of the new wealth which he admires in Germany (and which is distinctly *not* traceable to the famous “six milliards” paid by France) the large increase of the population which marks the recent stages of development—not in Berlin only, in which inhabitants are multiplying at a phenomenal rate—but in the empire as a whole. We in the United Kingdom, and our neighbours in France, seem often inclined to look upon those growing millions as a source rather of misery than of plenty. Germany tries to employ them to her profit, by providing homes and occupation for her multiplying children—sons, I ought to say ; for, of all countries, M. Fournier de Flaix finds that Germany employs the smallest number of women in the higher classes of occupation, making up for this defect, no doubt, by the heavy burden of drudgery which she lays upon female shoulders among the working classes. In respect of the cost of living, the table of prices given of primary necessities of life shows the balance not to be altogether so favourable to Germany as is often imagined. Milk, it is true, sells at Berlin at 25 centimes the litre, as compared with 40 centimes in Paris and 45 centimes in London. And beer sells at exactly the same figure, 25 centimes, as compared with 30 in Paris and 27·5 in London. Moreover, potatoes are to be had at Berlin for 9 francs the 100 kilos,

which is a sensible reduction upon our own 22 francs. But bread, "the staff of life," is to be procured in free-trade London at 37·4 centimes the kilo (which co-operative baking might, and in some cases does, reduce to somewhere about 20 centimes) as against 50 centimes in Berlin; sugar at 60 centimes the kilo, as against 100; coffee at 4·20 francs the kilo, as against 5; and pork at 2·60 francs, as against 4. Thus, on the whole, England has its own economies. The figures indicating the growth of commerce and shipping in Germany are very remarkable. Thus, while in the United Kingdom there has, between 1850 and 1889, been an advance in "general" commerce from 4,825,000,000 to 18,589,000,000 francs, the corresponding commerce of Germany has grown in the same period from 2,525,000,000 to 13,589,000,000 francs—a far more rapid rate of progress. France, it is true, is not much behindhand, having advanced from 2,700,000,000 to 10,123,000,000 francs. Indeed, German economists, I found recently in conversation with a leading professor of political economy who occupies the seat of Roscher, appear rather nervously afraid that France, whose growing military power is viewed with some anxiety at Berlin, may in commerce also be moving ahead more rapidly than their own country. For the growth of German shipping Professor Krümmel of Kiel gives, in the last but one number of the *Preussische Jahrbücher*, even more recent figures than M. Fournier de Flaix. And he finds that the increase of the German mercantile marine is really very much greater than figures indicate, inasmuch as the number of sailing vessels has very materially decreased, to the great preponderance of steamers of the best type, some of which were up to a very short time ago, on the showing of the Postmaster-General of the United States, the swiftest known upon the ocean. Only quite recently have we outstripped the fast-going Hamburg-American steamers by a fractional ratio of celerity, by bringing the Cunard *Campania* on the scene. M. Fournier de Flaix gives economic sketches of the principal centres of German commercial life—Hamburg, Bremen, Berlin, Königsberg, etc.—and he enters with evident zest and with very careful observation into the leading social questions of the day, the condition and prospects of the working classes, and the origin and growth of that redoubtable "Socialism" which the German authorities now recognize as their foremost and most dangerous foe. He draws a comparison between French and German Socialism which is, in his opinion, favourable to the German article, inasmuch as German Socialism does not, like French, obliterate the patriotic sentiment. To those who view Socialism with serious apprehension it may be a comfort to learn that

M. Fournier de Flaix has found it, under careful observation, to be growing indeed, but fissiparous. The more it grows, the more does it split up into sections, between which common action must become increasingly difficult. Against this dividing force, the author pits the peculiar aptness which economic history has shown the Germans to possess for that joint co-operative action which a leading French co-operator quite recently rather happily christened "the union for life," as opposed to "the struggle for life." Germany is the chosen home, the prolific nursery, of some of the more important forms of co-operation, in discussing which M. Fournier de Flaix, an old student of co-operation, is in his own element.

The care and cool discrimination with which M. Fournier de Flaix has entered upon his task in these two introductory volumes promises exceedingly well for that portion which, after all, we shall have to look upon as the most important part of the work—the volumes dealing with Russia, about which there ought to be a great deal more to say which is at the same time new and interesting, and of which, with the peculiar advantages at his disposal, the author ought to be able to tell more than less authoritatively accredited visitors.

HENRY W. WOLFF.

LABOUR, AND THE POPULAR WELFARE. By W. H. MALLOCK. [336 pp. Crown 8vo. 6s. Black. London, 1893.]

Mr. Mallock is an artist whose touch is as sure when he is dealing with economics as when he is pursuing some theme less serious and "dismal." His work, entitled *Labour, and the Popular Welfare*, will be read widely. Possibly, however, it will not be read by those persons whom the author professes especially to address. For he bids us regard his work, not as a contribution to Economic Science, but as a political pamphlet with a purpose that is immediately practical. And yet the parts of the book that are obviously "practical" in their design deal with matters so trite, that half a column of newspaper in the silly season would be too much to devote to their discussion. Mr. Mallock constructs a man of straw in the shape of the Socialist who calls for an equalization of incomes, and of course triumphantly demolishes him. The same Socialist is then revived and charged with further heresies, to wit, with the doctrines that the labourer is the "slave" of capital, that, if the labourer serve, he should serve the State, and so on; and once more the man of straw succumbs to Mr. Mallock's logic. If, then, the book in question is addressed to Socialists of this primeval type, it is to be feared that

it will fail to reach them, either because they have ceased to exist, or because their reading is confined to *Reynolds's Newspaper*.

On the other hand, the economist of scientific bent will find much food for reflection in the elaborate argument wherewith Mr. Mallock arms himself for this cannonading of tomtits. All, it is true, is not of equal merit. A philosopher might quarrel with the definition that the end of government is to provide as many as possible with a sufficient income. But the analysis of those most befogged conceptions, labour and capital—the real business of the book, whatever Mr. Mallock may say—is excellent.

Labour—to paraphrase Mr. Mallock's argument—is muscle, capital is brain. The labouring man to-day, though he may be working with a thousand other "hands" in a factory full of machinery instead of sitting by himself at a hand-loom, contributes to the work, roughly speaking, very much the same amount of skill and endurance as did the solitary spinner of the days before Hargraves and Arkwright. This being so, if labour were by itself responsible for the growth of the national income, we should expect to find the wealth of the country to have increased more or less in proportion with its population. But what are the facts? In a hundred years, the income of the country has risen from some £140,000,000, to £1,200,000,000, whilst the population has grown from 10,000,000 to 38,000,000. With the extra wealth then that is not accounted for by the growth of population, capital and not labour, brain and not muscle, is to be credited. Brain,—“ability,” as Mr. Mallock calls it,—has brought about this increase of wealth by judiciously directing industry; and the wages and machinery that form the “capital” with which business is conducted are thus so much “congealed ability.” Profits Mill has analyzed into interest, insurance, and the wages of superintendence. Interest is the reward of a certain kind of ability—not, however, rare, and therefore not highly remunerated. On the other hand, insurance is the wage of foresight, a rarer kind of ability; and this kind of ability it is that, conjoined with the ability to direct a great business, reaps the large harvest of profits so envied by the working class. Once let capital be identified with ability, and Mr. Mallock has an easy task to prove that to propose to nationalize brain is to propose nonsense.

But it is one thing to show that brain is responsible by itself for at least half the national income, and another to show that in the nature of things the man of brain is likely to get for himself that half. Mr. Mallock is so far from saying this that he hints—though not so explicitly as might be wished—how organized labour may beat

down the brain-worker to a comparatively reasonable "living wage." The working classes do as a matter of fact possess far more of the income of the nation than they have earned by their work. Why is this? Because the brain-workers have been content with something less than their rights, because a sufficient inducement to save, speculate, and direct was afforded by some fraction of the huge total of profits. If, then, Labour has encroached on the property of capital so far already, how far further may not its greedy fingers spread? Up to the point at which the inducement to save, speculate, and direct begins to wane. How that habit of saving will be seriously checked by the inroads of trades-unionism, there is at present no sign. But is not capital being "driven away" in the sense that ability is being forced to expend its energies, speculative and directive, upon foreign business? If this be so, does it not look as if labour were trying to beat down capital to something below its "living wage"? This, and not the cheap truth that some Socialists are fools, is the moral of Mr. Mallock's argument on which he should have laid chief stress.

Mr. Mallock's fundamental position may, however, be attacked, and his moral shown to be by no means the most important one that is to be drawn from the consideration of the relations of labour and capital. Mr. Mallock's mistake consists in his drawing too hard-and-fast a line between directive ability as the dynamic, and manual labour as the stationary, factor in production. What of "skilled labour"? If this skill be ranked as capital—"personal capital,"—is it not entitled in its own right to a share of the capitalist's profits, a share proportionate to the ratio in which its increase exceeds the increase of population? Moreover, if the labourer be thus a capitalist, do not our terms, capital and labour, run hopelessly into one another? On the other hand, if the skill of the labourer be included as an essential attribute in our conception of labour, and be not regarded as a kind of capital, then how may we venture to assert that labour is practically what it was a hundred years ago, and worthy of no greater remuneration than what it then earned? Surely the most conspicuous feature of our present industrial condition is the constantly increasing demand for technical skill on the part of the candidate for regular work. The true moral, then, to be drawn from the facts that Mr. Mallock reviews is something more exhilarating than that labour may beg or steal something more from profits, but that it must steal deftly, or it will drive ability out of the land. Rather let the economist lay all the stress he can on the duty of the workman to attend to his own self-improvement. Labour can never afford to discard directive ability,

and it may be that distinct persons, and even a distinct class, will continue to earn relatively large wages of superintendence in Utopia. But the ability that displays itself in the form of working well under direction is also a necessary element in a healthy and progressive industrial state; and as this kind of ability develops among working men, there is good reason to suppose that it will approve its claim to a share of profits, as much greater than the present share of labour, as the skilled artisan of the future will be of greater usefulness than the factory "hand" of to-day, so stupefied and distraught with long hours of monotonous toil as never to dream of improving either himself or his art.

R. R. MARETT.

SOCIAL PEACE. A Study of the Trade Union Movement in England. By DR. G. VON SCHULZE-GÆVERNITZ. Translated by C. M. WICKSTEED, B.A. Edited by GRAHAM WALLAS, M.A. [xx., 300 pp. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. Sonnenschein. London, 1893.]

In the preface to the German edition of *Zum Socialen Frieden*, Dr. G. Von Shulze-Gævernitz explains the reason which led him to study the movement towards social peace in England. He wished to show how the German people might "become one nation again," by pointing to the history of a nearly related people, who had been brought by economic causes face to face with the vital question half a century earlier than Germany. The chapters which have been selected from this larger work and translated into English in the present volume, form a study of the Trade-union movement in England. And this movement is treated as an "outer form" of an "inner movement," "viz. the vast revolution in thought which carried men from an individualistic political economy and a utilitarian philosophy to an organic view of society and of the place and duties of the individual." England, under the conditions brought about by the industrial revolution and thoroughly imbued with the Individualistic Political Economy, fell, as Disraeli pointed out, into two nations. And the aim of Dr. Von Schulze-Gævernitz is to show how she has gradually grown into one nation again. The repeal of the Combination Laws and the beginning of Factory Legislation were the first steps. Since then trade organization, aided by constructive politics, has brought about a community of interest between the employers and the workmen. And where the trade organization is most perfect, there the community of interest is most fully realized. To prove this, the author enters very fully into the history of the different trade-unions. He relies on statistics showing England's increased material prosperity to prove

that this is no "abnormal growth." "If this advance had been incompatible with, or even detrimental to, the present method of production, it would have no significance except as an abnormal growth, it could not be regarded as the basis of that gradual and peaceful revolution which is to raise the working-classes into a definite partnership in the spiritual inheritance of mankind hitherto monopolized by a few."

"Progress consists in the development of what already exists" is the lesson which Dr. Von Schulze-Gävernitz would draw from his study of the trade-union movement. That movement owes its success, not to the destruction of profits and interest, but to the development of combination and organization among the workers. Perhaps this view of progress requires emphasizing in England as well as in Germany. For though the "strong tinge of Socialism" among the English working-classes may not prevent them from taking "a path which is strictly practical," it may, at the least, influence public opinion against them, by giving to their programme an appearance rather of arbitrary change than of natural development.

F. M. BUTLIN.

CHRIST AND ECONOMICS. By CHARLES WILLIAM STUBBS, M.A., Dean of Ely. [292 pp. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. Isbister. London, 1893.]

Any one who turns to this book with the idea of finding a ready-made solution of the speculative difficulties which beset its subject, a ready-made panacea for all social and economic evils, or even a detailed answer to the practical questions which beset the individual conscience in the attempt to apply the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount to the actual conduct of trade or expenditure of wealth, will possibly experience some disappointment at the contents of this volume. Mr. Stubbs's aim is something more modest than this. His book is a volume of sermons, and it is a matter for thankfulness that such sermons should actually have been delivered in a prominent Liverpool Church before congregations of well-to-do people. We can only wish that one could name two West-End London Churches—there is, perhaps, one—where one would be at all likely to hear such plain, sensible, manly Christian teaching on the duties of citizenship, the evils of vulgar luxury (there is a "noble," i.e. unselfish, luxury, which is commended), on the proper use of wealth, on "unthoughtful almsgiving," and kindred topics. There is just as much detail, just as much infusion of economic teaching, just as much of definite suggestion as is usually advisable in the ordinary sermon addressed to congregations more or less "mixed" in respect of age, sex, wealth,

social position, education, and spiritual discernment. We could wish that some of the people who are thrown into a blind frenzy by the bare suggestion that a clergyman should in any way concern himself with social and economic questions would just look into this book. It is a book that certainly could not have been written by one who was not a very serious and competent student of economic literature. Yet there is no definite expression of opinion upon any particular trade-dispute, no highly coloured denunciation of "the rich" or extravagant indulgence of democratic sentiment, and certainly not a word of party politics. In the way of ultimate social outlook, Mr. Stubbs has got nothing more alarming to suggest than profit-sharing and co-operation, of which last he says, "I am quite convinced that in this direction, at any rate, lies the ultimate solution of the industrial problem." Mr. Stubbs uses his economic knowledge mainly for the purpose for which every clergyman ought to possess and use more or less of economic knowledge, for the purpose of instructing his congregation in their social duties.

There is only one thing in these sermons which seems to me to call for any serious criticism, and that is the writer's mode of dealing with "the Political Economy of the Sermon on the Mount." Mr. Stubbs prints in parallel columns what "Christ says" and what "Political Economy says." Under the last head appear such maxims as "Undersell your friends," "*Laissez-faire, laissez-passer*," etc. Now, to the actual teaching which these columns are meant to illustrate there is little objection to be made, but surely it is not well to encourage, just as they are on the point of disappearing, the mischievous illusion that Political Economy is a body of precepts, least of all that such maxims as the above derive any support either from Economic Science or from the teachings of its best representatives at the present day.

It is truly refreshing to find that there lives so faithful and worthy a disciple of Maurice and Kingsley, both in theology and social teaching. Not that we have here a mere echo of the first great teacher: Mr. Stubbs's teaching may be described as Maurice up to date—Maurice adapted to the altered circumstances, and informed by the best economic teaching and experience, of the present day. I can only conclude with a renewed lament that there are not more such sermons in place of the dreary, if often elaborate and ingenious, devices for saying nothing in particular, of which so many Churchgoers have to complain. Mr. Stubbs's sermons are all the better adapted to become models for general imitation, inasmuch as, though eminently thoughtful and cultivated, they do not pretend to any

great eloquence or profundity or high originality. Very many clergymen might write sermons of this type—especially after reading Mr. Stubbs's—if they would have the courage to try, and not mind if an old woman or two of either sex leaves the Church in consequence. And for those who could not safely attempt anything of the kind, might we suggest that, when addressing educated congregations, they should occasionally take such a volume as Mr. Stubbs's into the pulpit, and read us a sermon from it, without thinking it necessary to copy it out in manuscript or otherwise assume its authorship?

H. RASHDALL.

DRUNKENNESS. By GEORGE R. WILSON, M.B., C.M., Assistant Physician, the Royal Aycliffe, Morningside, Edinburgh. [161 pp. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. Sonnenschein. London, 1893.]

This is a very interesting course of lectures, delivered lately to the students of the Edinburgh Free Church College. It is not to be taken "in any sense as a text-book of teetotalism," but as a "study of drunkenness regarded as a nervous disease." There is no desire "to explain away the drunkard's vice . . . or to abate the penalties attaching to his habits;" but it is claimed in justice that, if our treatment of him is to be severe, "it should also be appropriate" (Preface). After premising that "conduct is related to a physical basis," and that "self-control, habit, struggle, etc., have all their appropriate representation in the brain," the writer explains the nervous system, "the elective affinity" which seems to exist between brain-tissue and alcohol, and the phenomena of intoxication (chap. i.). We may discriminate between the drunkenness which is the outcome or evidence of a tainted stock, which stands near akin to insanity and epilepsy, and the drunkenness which carries heavier responsibility (p. 26), where habitual neglect of self-control has kept "the organic basis of altruism in abeyance," and soul and body have sunk together in corruption.

But we must face the fact that certain constitutions are predisposed to drunkenness. What, then, is to be said of hereditary intemperance in relation to the Weissmann theory of the non-transmission of acquired character (p. 61)? The theory, it is answered, cannot alter the ascertained fact that drunkenness does run in families. Only it will explain the fact somewhat differently. The nervous temperament, with its alcoholic bias, however originated, will be passed on unless modified by blending, and the environment does the rest. In short, the theory, if accepted, will make us far more alive to the enormous power of environment on infant and child-life. We shall confess especially that "the influence of the parental personality is far the most important environmental

factor in moulding character," both because of the constant presence of the parents, and because in their hands is the disposition of the home and early life.

In the longest chapter, that on "Therapeutics," great stress is laid on bringing up children according to nature. Here the teetotaler will not go away un comforted. "Youth is a time at which the nervous system is more susceptible to alcohol than in adult life. . . . On this account it is held by nearly all authorities on the subject that none should indulge in alcoholic beverages before the age of twenty-five, and that it is wise to postpone their use as long as possible" (p. 101). Moreover, for the inebriate, the right course is "the immediate and complete cessation from the use of alcohol: the belief that such sudden renunciation is dangerous is a fallacy" (p. 102). Much can be done by legislation to improve the surroundings. "The public-house, which exists on drunkenness, and the publican, who encourages it, are barbarous anachronisms." It is intolerable that "the sale of alcohol, which is to many men a poison, should be, to a great extent, subject merely to the law of supply and demand" (p. 119). The writer finds the evidence to be in favour of the Bergen and Gothenburg systems, and he pleads for compulsory powers by law to deal with habitual drunkards.

But Mr. Wilson by no means ignores the moral engines of warfare; and of all motives which can move the drunkard, he declares "religion the most effectual:" and he adds, "Were we not used to the phenomena of religious revivals, the force of reforming energy which they bring with them would strike us as little short of miraculous" (p. 110).

As to the general line of the book, no doubt it is true that the physiological aspect of drunkenness does start moral problems. But shall we avow that we are not alarmed to hear "that the lay mind is reluctant to refer moral effects to physical causes" (p. 93)? For have not these physical causes themselves a moral bearing? Men do not stand alone, and the second commandment, concerning a father's sin, is not yet repealed, however we explain its operation. To acknowledge the might of environment is not to deny guilt, but only to distribute its burden more widely and more justly. The army of English drunkards hold before our face a bright shield, wherein we are forced to regard our national self-indulgence, our avarice, and heartlessness; and we are startled to find that the drunkard has indeed other enemies besides himself—even the evil-doers of a whole nation.

But it is well to be reminded that all drunkards are not equally responsible, especially well when it is a book so kindly and so wise which sets us thinking.

J. O. NASH.

SOCIALISM : ITS GROWTH AND OUTCOME. By WILLIAM MORRIS and E. BELFORT BAX. [viii., 335 pp. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. Sonnenschein. London, 1893.]

The title of this book is misleading. It contains no history of the growth of Socialism, and the outcome, having no connection with the growth, is purely imaginary. The first half is devoted to a sketch of the history of the progressive nations ; the latter half to the enumeration of a few well-known dates in the history of Socialism, to short biographies of a few well-known Socialists, to an analysis of Karl Marx's scientific Socialism, and to the authors' views of a socialistic future.

We gather from the introduction that the object of the first part is to destroy "an almost universal belief, not yet much broken into, that modern or bourgeois civilization is the final form of human society ;" to show "that civilization is only a stage in the development of the human race, just as barbarism was on the savagery of the progressive nations." [The word *civilization* is used to denote the present condition of society as opposed to the Social State of the future, which, by the way, is to be composed of *citizens*.] We should have thought that the theory of the growth of status into contract had by this time successfully "broken into" any other theories which the reading public may have held. It would surely have been better to have referred to well-known books or facts, than to have attempted a summary in so small a space. The impression left on the mind is that the authors must have been suffering from a nightmare arising from an over-hasty attempt to digest the works of Buckle, Maine, McLennan, etc. We find a hopeless want of perspective ; a crude assertion of facts still under controversy ; an equally crude assertion of novel opinions, not backed by argument ; also some obvious and easily avoided inaccuracies. Many details without any apparent significance are given, while the different civilizations into which the progressive nations developed are merely mentioned. Britain, without any comment, is placed among the countries governed by the Roman Civil Law with the tribal customs of the Teutons grafted on to it. Elizabeth is said to have "reduced the Tudor monarchy to an absurdity," but no reasons are given for considering her government more absurd than her father's. Charles V. did not fall "into possession of Spain by marriage ;" he inherited that country through his mother Joanna. Our authors have given us too few proofs of their insight into the past and present to give us confidence in their foresight into the future.

History is so complex that few people can hold opinions as to the

future the probability of which they would not be able to support by the analogy of past events. Yet, in spite of their title, our authors have made no attempt to show how the "outcome" of their Socialism is the effect of "growth." That for good or ill economic Socialism is surely gaining ground, no knowledge of past history is required to teach us. That views on religion, on family life, on marriage, on art, on politics, are tending every day to be more what our authors wish them to be, and less what they represent them, any candid person impartially regarding the signs of the times must allow. "Every reputable man" is not required to belong to some sect. There is nothing to prevent the intercourse between adult members of a family, now that women are more independent, from becoming purely voluntary; only, with regard to marriage, we are constrained to agree with our authors that civilization will have to cease before their views will become practicable. A glance at the most frequented picture-galleries of to-day would refute the statement that our present civilization "would reduce painting and sculpture to the production of petticoated dolls without bodies." Party government may be unsatisfactory, yet no strongly felt tendency of the people, socialistic or otherwise, can long exist without finding expression in legislation through the government. Civilization is not incapable of socialistic modification.

All these conscious or unconscious misrepresentations have their origin in the idea by which our authors are possessed, that in forming the future we should destroy the past, not fulfil its possibilities. They would destroy supernatural religion; yet the change they expect to take place in human nature, without which, as an hypothesis, they could not build up their theory of a future state, is in the strictest sense supernatural. Grant them that one *change*—then they have a fair field before them; but they have passed from the paths of historical deduction into the realms of the imagination. Yet they appeal to history, and in fairness we should quote that appeal. "At least we can boldly assert that those who think that the civilization of our own time will not be transformed both in shape and in essence, hold their opinion in the teeth of the witness of all history. This cannot be set aside by taking refuge in platitudes about 'human nature,' which are really deduced from orthodox theology and an obsolete view of history. Human nature is itself a growth of the ages, and is ever indefinitely moulded by the conditions under which it finds itself." If our authors could point out one human passion which in any society, from the beginning of history to the present day, has been overcome, or which, being temporarily crushed, has not had its reaction, we might believe this

to be a whole truth, and not a half-truth, and that individuals will cease to be guided by selfish considerations. If they could point out to us a society in which for any length of time all the members were agreed as to the wisest course to be adopted for the welfare of the community, we might believe that a socialistic state could supersede party government.

Our authors have learned from history that there has been change in the past ; they should have gone a step further, and learned that we can only conjecture what form that change will take from studying the tendencies of the present, so that in discussing Socialism they might not have connected the outcome with the growth only in the title.

F. M. BUTLIN.

THE RIGHTS OF WOMEN. By M. OSTROGORSKI. [232 pp. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. Sonnenschein. London, 1893.]

This volume is in the main a translation of the essay by which M. Ostrogorski secured the first prize in the international competition opened by the Paris Faculté de Droit on the subject of women's rights, and which was praised by the judges for its moderation and acumen, its vigour of treatment and excellence of method. The chief alterations consist in a recasting of the concluding chapter, and in the addition of two appendices, one relating to the attitude of the St. Simonians towards women, and the other elaborately describing the civil condition of females in various Continental countries. The English version leaves little to be desired, except, at times, in the order of the words : such sentences as "In this respect is especially noteworthy the progress made in the organization for women's education," can hardly be described as English in form.

Those who take up M. Ostrogorski's book in the expectation of finding an abstract discussion of what ought to be the status of women will be disappointed. Its object is not speculative, but historical—not a statement of theory, but a statement of fact. It gives a description of the legal rights actually possessed by women in the various European countries and in the United States, but particularly of those legal rights which are of a public character, such as the franchise, whether in local or imperial concerns, eligibility to public offices and employments, and liberty of instruction. It is woman's actual legal position, not her general position or her aims, that is dealt with in this volume, which can truly claim to be "a unique attempt to collect and reduce to a system all the available information on the subject."

In primitive times woman appears everywhere in a position of

subordination, if not of subjection. Even the enlightened philosophy of Greece did little or nothing for her emancipation ; and the great democratic statesman of Athens, if Thucydides can be trusted, regarded the best woman as the one about whom least was known. In this degraded condition the sex generally continued for centuries. The great movement for liberty of a hundred years ago did not at first affect woman ; "natural rights" were held to attach to mankind in the male sex and not in the female, and were even invoked to justify and sanction the inferior position of the latter. Rousseau himself declared that "woman was specially created in order to please man ;" and the mighty Mirabeau held that by nature, "by the eternal fitness of things," her position was at home, and by the hearth ; elsewhere she was out of place. In time, however, the "gospel" of freedom inevitably told in her favour. Her emancipation was only temporarily postponed, not defeated for ever.

A general survey of the rights at present enjoyed by woman in different countries indicate that her position is better in Teutonic nations than in Latin, and is best of all in the United States. France, the leader in the crusade for the "rights of man," is by no means liberal towards the female sex. Russia, on the other hand, though most stationary or reactionary in political matters, allows women the fullest measure of civil rights. An examination of the nature of the privileges possessed by woman leads to a curious and interesting conclusion. It appears that while States have given her, or are preparing to give her, economic and intellectual emancipation, they draw a rigid line at that point, and resolutely refuse to concede political power. Only New Zealand and Wyoming have conferred the parliamentary franchise on her. M. Ostrogorski suggests a philosophical justification for the distinction thus made, on the ground that economic and intellectual freedom is absolutely necessary for the complete development of the individual, and is the individual's right independently of society, while political emancipation is not so necessary, and is, moreover, the gift of society, and does not exist prior to it. The defence of the distinction, however, is not altogether happy. It is difficult to see how any rights, in the sense of legal rights, or rights enforceable in the courts if disputed or interfered with, are other than due to society. The individual may have claims or moral rights, but the sanction of the State is required to convert these into legal rights. But apart from this point, is there not something arbitrary and dogmatic in assuming or asserting that the local franchise is requisite for full self-realization, but the imperial is not ? that a woman cannot properly make the most of her gifts unless she votes for a county

councillor, and that she can do so without voting for a member of parliament? Nay, the doubt at once arises whether economic freedom itself does not imply and involve the parliamentary suffrage. In its name Mrs. Fawcett and others demand the franchise for woman, arguing that it is required to protect her in industrial matters against the selfish legislation of man. Can she be said to be free economically, if her interests are sacrificed by laws, in the enactment of which she has no share? Is not her freedom an unreal or bogus freedom?

Whether woman is entitled to or ought to enjoy the same rights as man, is the ultimate, fundamental question. In connection with it, two considerations suggest themselves. First, does not equality of privileges imply equality of burdens? Is it not pure justice that, if women have the same rights with man, they should discharge the same duties? And shall no distinction of function be made between the sexes, as Plato long ago proposed? In the second place, it is not without interest to note that philosophers, from Aristotle to Schopenhauer, have generally been adverse to the claims of women, basing their opposition on the natural inferiority of the sex. Eminent scientists also have taken the same view. By appeals to cerebral physiology they have proved, or attempted to prove, that the female brain is inferior in structure to the male. Fifty years ago the founder of Positivism asserted that it possessed a proportionately smaller intellectual part; and recently the great Italian brain-specialist has declared it to be destitute of secondary convolutions. But "Strife is the father of all things," and the question of women's rights is likely to be more influenced by the rival bidding of political parties than by philosophic dogma or scientific fact.

G. W. POWERS.

SHORT NOTICES.

THE THEORY AND POLICY OF LABOUR PROTECTION.

By Dr. A. SCHÄFFLE. Edited by A. C. MORANT. [252 pp. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. Sonnenschein. London, 1893.]

Students who have been interested in Dr. Schäffle's constructive policy of "Positive Social Reform," as expounded in his earlier books, will be ready to welcome this further instalment in its English translation. By "Labour Protection" the author has mainly in view those regulations which seek to safeguard the workman by limiting the hours of his employment, or by providing proper conditions in which he may carry on his occupation. The long chapter on the

"Maximum Working-day" is particularly interesting; and there is an appendix containing the "Industrial Code Amendment Bill" brought in by the German Government in 1891. It is instructive to notice in this connection that Dr. Schäffle attaches great importance to the development of international commissions on the lines of the Berlin Conference, which might eventually lead to combined action on the part of the nations of Western Europe in regard to various kinds of labour protection.

ENGLAND'S FOREIGN TRADE IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY. By ARTHUR L. BOWLEY, B.A. [152 pp. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. Sonnenschein. London, 1893.]

We have here in popular form a short account of the main economic and social results of our foreign trade during the century. In its original form this essay was awarded the Cambridge University Cobden prize in 1892, and it has now been revised and enlarged. Mr. Bowley had done his work with becoming modesty and care, and his readers should be especially grateful for the ten statistical diagrams which have been accurately drawn and included in the book.

SUICIDE AND INSANITY. A Physiological and Sociological Study. By S. A. K. STRAHAN, M.D., Barrister-at-Law. [228 pp. Crown 8vo. 5s. Sonnenschein. London, 1893.]

The remarkable prevalence of the suicidal mania in England would lead us to welcome this contribution to a better understanding of the facts. Mr. Strahan brings to his task a combination of legal and medical qualifications, and has marshalled an array of statistics which goes far towards establishing his main contention, that the greater part of the increase of suicide in recent years is due to hereditary transmission. It is hard to follow him, however, in his distinction between "Rational or Quasi Suicide" and "Irrational or True Suicide;" and it is impossible for a Christian to accept his conclusions as to the moral and theological aspects of this terrible social bane.

THE CO-PARTNERSHIP OF LABOUR.

THERE is probably no part of Economic History better known to the readers of this *Review* than the movement of the Christian Socialists of 1848. The names of Maurice, Kingsley, Neale and the others are household words, and lately one of the two survivors of the band has given us an account of the men with whom he worked.¹ English Co-operation looks to Owen as its chief founder, and that part of the movement we are about to describe, and which the Labour Association exists to promote, is no exception. Still it is also so largely a continuation, or rather development, of the organization of labour attempted by the Christian Socialists, that we must first set out briefly their ideal, wherein it was an advance on earlier efforts, wherein it appears to have failed, and what modifications time and experience have effected in it to bring about the present growth of co-operative production on the principle known as "the co-partnership of labour."

The Christian Socialists made this step forward in developing the co-operative idea in England. They conceived no longer of self-supporting communities which the conditions of modern industry had rendered impossible, but of communities for carrying on some special trade in the common interest. They sought to establish self-governing workshops, in which the actual workers should own or borrow all the capital, should elect the committee of management from among themselves, and, subject to a payment to a central provident fund, should enjoy all the ultimate profit, of which, however, they were required to capitalize at least one-third. They perceived, indeed, and stated² that this form of organization was not suited to the classes of workers at the bottom of the social and moral scale, nor yet to those who must work with the aid of large masses of capital. The solution of the problem in these spheres they deliberately

¹ See Mr. Ludlow's articles, October, 1893, and January, 1894.

² *The Christian Socialist*, No. 39, vol. ii., July 26, 1851.

left for a future time to work out, considering that there was field enough for themselves among skilled workers not using any large amount of capital. They accordingly set up in business a number of societies of tailors, shoemakers, etc., on the lines above indicated. In doing this they appear to have made three main mistakes, which helped to cause their societies to fail. They found practically all the money, which they lent to the societies, so that the men had nothing really at stake: they took the workmen applying for membership as they came, not attempting to get picked men; and lastly, they gave them at first full control over their workshops—that is, over other people's property. They soon found that the men thus brought together did not at all rise to the occasion, but were animated by a thoroughly mercenary, quarrelsome, and narrow spirit. Attempts at reconstruction and control led to no good result, and the societies came to an end one after another.

The teaching, however, of the Christian Socialists lived on, combining with a more exclusively Owenite element. Many attempts were made from time to time; and after the granting of limited liability to co-operators in 1862, especially as we get near to 1870 and pass it, we find a new growth of societies, many of which, it is true, failed lamentably, but some of which have flourished and continued true to their principles until to-day: societies, moreover, which have been followed and are being followed by a whole movement. The most celebrated of this new growth is the Hebden Bridge Fustian Manufacturing Society, which, beginning in 1870 with threepenny subscriptions to raise capital, now has £33,000 of it, produces goods worth £40,000 a year, makes a profit of about £4000, and employs nearly three hundred workers, every one of whom receives a share of profit in proportion to his earnings, and at the first distribution of profit becomes a member, that is a shareholder, of the society, with a voice in its affairs according to the class of shares, and therefore the amount of risk, which he takes.

Now, the distinctive points in which the societies of this new growth, speaking broadly, differ from the self-governing workshops of the Christian Socialists are these—

- (i.) The workers receive a share of the profit, not the whole;

(ii.) They enjoy a share of the control, not the whole;

(iii.) The societies have not been started for workmen by outsiders desiring to do good, but by workmen for themselves, with or without outside help: in a few highly honourable instances by employers desiring the higher position of co-worker rather than that of master; or lastly, by Co-operative Societies previously conducted on other lines.

It has, in fact, been realized that as the workers cannot provide the whole capital, and therefore take the whole responsibility, they cannot claim the whole profit or the whole control; that the finder of capital is equally entitled to his share, and similarly the provider of organized custom, *i.e.* the store; moreover, that as a matter of expediency the presence of an outside element in a society is of the highest value. The worker's share of control over the common property is made conditional upon his taking a real share in the common risk. Moreover, the workers who make the start are practically picked men—either as being of sufficient enlightenment to desire better things and sufficient energy to work for them, or else as the tried staff of an established business.

In thus contrasting the apparent failures of forty years ago with the considerable amount of present success, it would be very unfair to forget that we owe the latter largely to changes which those early pioneers did much to bring about. How far what we have called their mistakes (some, at least, of which they were themselves quick to recognize) could have been avoided in the circumstances of that time it is difficult to say; and though, for the purpose of comparison, we cite them, the real causes of failure must probably be sought deeper, in the state of the law, and the unpreparedness at that time of the great mass of the working classes. This is indicated by the equally marked failure of other similar societies started then, or soon after, by actual workers with their own resources. The work of the Christian Socialists, however, went far beyond the mere setting up of a few associations: they gave an impetus to the movement, and promoted the union of co-operators throughout the country: they obtained from parliament legal protection for the property of Co-operative Societies, and other improvements in the law; and

they did much to bring about the progress of general education and the business training of workmen in Trade Unions, Friendly Societies, and Co-operative Stores. These are the things which have made the recent growth of co-operative production possible.

Co-partnership, then, is that principle in carrying on industry by which the worker has a direct share in the profit of his own work, and in the control of it. Such being the principle, to what volume of business has it been applied, in what forms has it been embodied for practice? what are its economic and social advantages, what its difficulties, and what its prospects?

But first we would emphasize the distinction between co-partnership and profit-sharing. The latter is a necessary element in the former, but only one of two, the other being control-sharing. Where a capitalist pays his workers a share of the profit they help to produce, that may be an excellent thing according to the object sought by it and the system on which it is done; but if he retains all the capital and all the control in his own hands, it is not co-partnership. In co-partnership the worker is also allowed to invest in the business his share of profit or his other savings, and so to obtain a share in capital and control. We may also contrast co-partnership with other forms of co-operation, particularly with consumers' co-operation, which has filled large parts of England with its workmen's stores, and become a great employer of labour. Consumers' co-operation, as usually practised in England, returns all net profit to the purchasers as dividend upon the amount of their purchases. Consumers' societies are of two kinds: primary societies or stores consisting of individual members, and secondary societies which are federations of stores, and admit no individual members. In the first the employees may at least become members in their capacity as consumers, though they are ineligible for the committee of management, and are sometimes by rule or practice disfranchised altogether. In the federal bodies all capital, control, and, with few exceptions, profit belong to the stores. If circumstances permit, the worker may indeed become a member of a store, and enjoy, like any other, his share of its profit, such profit including a small dividend from the federal body which employs him. In the

largest of the federal bodies, the English Co-operative Wholesale Society, consisting of over a thousand societies, with more than three quarters of a million members, the individual worker is practically cut off from any share in the results and control of his own industry as thoroughly as if he worked for a private employer. The "consumers' theory," on which consumers' co-operation is based, is that, where all profit is returned to the purchasers, it is in fact returned to the whole community, inasmuch as every one is at liberty to become a member of a store; and that thus "profit on price" is entirely eliminated.

The new growth of productive societies, beginning soon after 1862, counted for a long time so few successes, that for the year 1883, in which the Labour Association was formed "for promoting co-operative production, based on the co-partnership of the workers," the statistics of the Co-operative Union only showed a meagre development of fifteen co-partnership societies. On the other hand, when one of the present writers gave evidence in January, 1893, before the Labour Commission, he was able to show a remarkable growth of from three to fourfold in an interval of about eight and a half years. These are the figures:—

				1883.	1891-92.
Number of Societies	..			15 ¹	47 ²
Members	..			2557	11,050
Sales for the year		£160,751	£666,688
Capital	£103,436	£326,839
Profits	£9031	£37,896
Losses	£114	£295

Profit is here used as including interest on share capital, but not on loans, and, after deducting the small losses, it was equal in the earlier year to 13 per cent. upon the share capital employed; in the later, it was 20 per cent., and at least £5826 of it was paid as dividend upon labour.

Nor is this all. During the eighteen months next following these later figures, the increase has been quite 50 per cent., owing to the growth of old societies, the foundation of new

¹ The figures for 1883 have, by subsequent information, been proved incomplete, and the same is already true of those for 1891-2; but both are sufficiently complete for a fair comparison.

² There were also ten new societies of which we had no figures, and one which had only just adopted the principle.

ones, and the adoption of co-partnership by those previously conducted on other principles. We are well within the truth in giving the following as the present statistics of the movement:—

Number of Societies	75
Workers	7000
Capital	£500,000
Sales	£1,000,000

To give a clearer idea of what these figures mean, we append the table of societies and their affairs, presented to the Royal Commission, and, following that, short accounts of a few typical societies, illustrating the applicability of the principle to many varying circumstances.

Established.	NAME.	Business.	Members.	Workers.	Share & Loan Capital.	Reserves.	Profit.	Loss.	Profit to Labour.
		£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
1860	Eccles Manuf. Soc.	20,450	311	98	22,564	500	1149
1862	Paisley Manuf. Soc.	50,325	1014	250	39,057	1194	5059	..	556
1867	Agricultural, etc., Association	86,326	3067	125	42,077	4371	4280	..	799
1869	Manchester Printing Soc. ..	63,149	607	330	32,126	5691	6030	..	447
1870	Hebden Bridge Fustian Soc. ..	43,184	742	290	23,589	4205	5376	..	618
1872	Airedale Worsted Manuf. Soc. ..	14,100	265	30	3797	669	913	..	36
1872	Dunfermline Manuf. Soc. ..	1006	95	16	1002	203	101	..	11
1872	North Seaton Farming Soc. ..	649	104	..	330	195	92
1873	Walsall Padlock Soc.	14,722	63	200	2333	1203	1029	..	700
1873	Sheffield Cutlery Soc.	2121	66	60	512	350	273	..	19
1873	Newcastle Furnishing Soc. ..	14,255	73	93	15,657	..	506
1873	Edinburgh Printing Soc. ..	9487	139	73	15,766	1000	995	..	199
1874	Leek Silk Twist Soc.	8985	41	41	1796	158	301	..	85
1874	Dudley Nailmakers' Soc. ..	300	12	15	57	..	2
1876	Coventry Watchmakers' Soc. ..	3990	105	40	2006	667	196	..	70
1876	Leicester Hosiery Soc.	24,086	297	180	16,456	680	1020	..	44
1881	Northamptonshire Boot Soc. ..	16,982	43	129	1764	200	633	..	274
1882	Midland Nailmakers' Soc. ..	356	8	15	268	18	25
1883	Assington Farm Soc.	1217	281	..	3381	..	35
1884	Hinckley Hosiery Soc.	1463	50	..	240	..	30
1885	London Bookbinders' Soc. ..	587	81	6	408	4	..	24	..
1885	Norwich Boot and Shoe Soc. ...	2000	198	15	352	3	80	..	6
1885	Co-operative Sundries Manuf. Soc. ..	12,127	174	50	5213	107	34
1885	Keighley Ironworks Soc.	5361	200	24	5467	150	490	..	34
1886	Finedon Boot and Shoe Soc. ..	19,881	27	134	2127	..	597
1886	W. Thompson and Son	31,883	235	130	17,716	150	1572	..	463
1886	Burnley Self-Help Soc.	57,755	270	200	6993	679	998	..	137
1887	Leicester Boot and Shoe Soc. ..	33,000	866	250	6666	800	1934	..	678
1887	Walsall Cart-Gear Soc.	576	22	8	220	..	31
1887	Midland Tinplate Soc.	3332	78	50	917	134	..
1887	Raunds Boot and Shoe Soc. ..	14,529	19	160	1290	312	842
1887	London Productive Soc.	2724	162	10	2547	..	73
1888	Tingdene Boot and Shoe Soc. ..	12,033	26	..	647	..	55
1888	Alcester Needle Soc.	699	124	25	1049	21	29
1888	Dudley Bucket and Fender Soc. ..	6841	19	30	929	167	493	..	156
1888	Kettering Boot and Shoe Soc. ..	17,471	358	150	3083	219	1275	..	490
1888	Broomsgrave Nail Forgers' Soc. ..	398	145	38	283	32	21
1888	Brighton Artisans' Soc.	102	35	23	32	..	2
1888	Co-operative Builders' Soc. (Brixton)	25,945	180	170	4056	908	216
1889	Bristol Pioneers' Boot Soc. ..	4249	77	..	826	30	..
1890	Scotch Tweed Manuf. Soc.	19,972	355	100	24,934	112	806
1890	Atherstone Hat Soc.	5352	64	55	1822	50	177
1890	Hinckley Boot Soc.	21	..	270
1891	Lye Sheet-Iron Works Soc. ..	4466	92	40	1219
1891	Bradford Cabinet Makers' Soc. ..	1875	49	10	443	26	68
1892	Nottingham Tailors' Soc.	165	..	9	173	..	4
1892	London Leather Manuf. Soc. ..	122	..	11	172	..	7
		666,688	11,050	3683	326,839	24,946	37,896	296	5526

NEW SOCIETIES.

Estab.	Name.	Estab.	Name.
1892	Walsall Horse Collar Society.	1892	Shirtmakers' (London) Society.
"	Boness Pottery Society.	"	Sheffield Tailors' Society.
"	Walsall Bridle Bit Society.	"	Brownfield's Guild Pottery
"	General Builders' (London)	"	Society.
"	Society.	"	Liverpool Tailors' Society.
"	London Coal Porters' Society.	"	Medway Barge Builders' Society.
"	Union Confectioners' Society.		

Principle adopted 1892—Scottish Co-operative Wholesale Society.

The Wolverhampton Plate Locksmiths are an instance of a Society failing. Registered in 1864, its object being to raise the condition of the workers in a trade where average wages were not more than 12s. per week, the society started with a capital of £13, but was so well managed that by October, 1864, it had over fifty men at work, the total employed in the trade being only about two hundred and fifty. The employers became alarmed, and endeavoured to ruin the society by reducing prices below the cost of production, and by trying to prevent it from getting raw material and by discharging employees who held shares. The public came to their aid, and amongst others Mr. J. S. Mill, and they survived. In 1877 they had a hundred and twenty men at work, over a hundred of whom were shareholders holding from thirty to forty shares each, and they were earning double the wages they had earned previous to the society starting. But a great depression came in the trade. This led to an accumulation of stock, owing to misjudgment, and as trade did not revive, they could not meet their liabilities with cash, and being pressed for payment they went into liquidation, although "virtually solvent."

The Paisley Manufacturing Society was started in 1862 by a few weavers and others that had had some experience in consumers' co-operation, and has been a success from the commencement. The society manufactures dress stuffs, skirtings, etc. The consumers are strongly represented in this society, and receive a large share of the profits. In 1870 the capital was £1177, and sales £2463. In 1893 the capital was £51,000, and sales £52,973.

The Walsall Padlock Society is an instance of Co-operative Production being very successful in a sweated industry. It started in 1872 with a capital of £83, is purely a producers' society, and sends its goods into various parts of the world. It was the result of a strike, and met with great opposition from the masters; has frequently helped other workers in the trade to improve their position, and pays a higher rate of wages than other firms, often by as much as 10 per cent. When it started, padlocks were made in domestic workshops, but the society has led the way, and brought its business into a very fine factory. The capital at the end of 1893 was £5342; trade for the year, £14,000; and profit, £814, of which £520 went to the workers as a $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. dividend on their wages. This society does so large a proportion of the padlock trade, that it is believed to have rendered a strike or lock-out impossible.

The Coventry Watch Society is an instance of success in high-class work. The society was started by a small number of working watchmakers, and registered in 1876. The trade has steadily increased. The workers control the society. Alterations in the price of work have taken place without friction.

The Burnley Self-Help Weaving Society was registered in 1886, and deserves special attention, for two reasons—first, because of the fact that the workers guarantee the interest on capital out of their wages; secondly, because they have, since 1889, themselves agreed to a fixed manager for ten years. The workers paid two half-years' losses, amounting to 10 per cent. of their wages earned during the previous six months in each case; and on another occasion losses amounting to $16\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the wages earned in the previous quarter. Since 1889 the society has greatly improved its financial position, and, besides wiping off all previous losses, has placed to reserve fund over £1000, and has paid a share of profit to workers and customers. The society employs two hundred workpeople.

The Agricultural and Horticultural Association (the "A. and H.") is a consumers' society, a primary society, which has gone largely into manufacture, and has admitted its workers to a large share of profits and the right of membership. As a fact

not many employees are members, because, though the association makes good profits, no interest is paid on shares at present, and until this is resumed it has been thought better to put the workers' accumulations to loan account, which, of course, does bear interest. This does not prevent their having a large voice in the control of their workshops. The results in this case have been most remarkable in increasing earnings, preventing strikes, and promoting intelligence, invention, and character.

The Scottish Co-operative Wholesale Society is a consumers' federal body, which has gradually adopted our principle. For some years they gave a bonus to their workers, but did not allow them to take shares or participate in management. At the end of 1892 they amended their rules, so that the workers may take shares and capitalize their profit, and may elect one delegate to the quarterly meeting for each hundred and fifty working shareholders. As these rules affect some two thousand workers in production, besides another thousand in distribution, they mark a great advance, more especially seeing that the friends of co-partnership have for some years been striving to secure the same rights for the workers employed by the English Co-operative Wholesale Society, which hitherto has declared such a step to be impracticable. The Scottish workers have already applied for shares in large numbers.

William Thomson and Sons is an instance of a private employer converting his business into a society upon our basis. In this case the first few years were not very prosperous, many old customers declining to have anything to do with a co-operative cloth. The tide has, however, turned, and for three or four years they have done well.

It will be seen from the figures presented to the Commission, and quoted above, that the number of members is considerably greater than the number of workers; the outside members consist very largely of workmen following the same trades in the same neighbourhood, or of the unions belonging to those trades; largely also of stores which take this way of investing their surplus capital and promoting the co-operative cause, and only

to a small extent of middle-class investors, mostly sympathizers. There are no general statistics available to show what proportion of the capital is in the hands of the actual workers. In some of the societies we know it to be large; in the Burnley Self-Help more than two-thirds; in the Leicester Boot Society about one-fourth; in the Hebden Bridge more than a fifth. We believe that in many other societies the proportion is considerable, and that the tendency for it to increase is general, especially in those societies having a rule for capitalizing all or part of the workers' share of profit—a rule now very common.

The reader will have observed already divergences among the societies in several matters. Though there is very great variety in their constitutions, all have limited liability, being registered for the most part under the Industrial and Provident Societies Acts, with shares of £1 or less. Nearly all are based on the principle of one individual, one vote, while societies which are members may have extra votes. The societies also are all directed by a committee elected by the general meetings, and controlling the business through a secretary, and usually a manager. The differences are chiefly in defining who is eligible for committee, and how the profits are to be divided. Sometimes every member is equally eligible, and in some societies all, or almost all, the present committeemen are employees; sometimes a certain number of committeemen, but no more, *must* be employees; sometimes employees are excluded altogether. Again as to profits: the following rule of the Leicester Boot Society may be considered a type, or perhaps we should rather say, a model. After providing for 5 per cent. interest on share capital, for depreciation according to rule, and such sums for reserve fund, and for propagandist, charitable, and other purposes as the general meeting may decide, the remaining profit is divided:—

To Workers	40 per cent. of the net profit.
„ Customers	20 „ „ „
„ Officers and Committee	12 „ „ „
„ Provident Fund	10 „ „ „
„ Share capital, in addition to its interest at 5 per cent.	10 „ „ „
„ Educational Fund	5 „ „ „
„ Special Service Fund	3 „ „ „

But while this is typical of a number of the best societies, and while the same recipients, or some of them, occur in all societies—labour in particular always receiving a share of profit—the details vary without end, and many of the above funds are often absent, or only provided for by special grants.

Though this variety is made a subject of reproach to co-partnership societies by those who believe in unvarying machinery to fit the infinite variety of circumstances, we hold it within limits to be perfectly natural and right. Scarcely in any two cases do capital, labour, and organized custom contribute in the same proportions to the result. In one society the store demand is almost regular, and contributes largely to the economy of working; another society sells wholly to keen merchants who would send their orders anywhere for a fraction of a penny in the price. One society requires very little capital, and that little has very little risk; another requires a great deal, and at considerable risk. Moreover, ideas vary as well as circumstances. Naturally the division of profit varies correspondingly. Similarly with respect to control: in one society the workers themselves make the start and find the means, and here they very naturally hold nearly all the power; in another it is a private individual who is founder, and here he naturally has great power for a time; in a third the stores come in and bear most of the burden. Thus at Hebden Bridge, soon after the founding of the society, the stores brought in capital so largely that the actual workers at the end of 1873 held only $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the share capital, and scarcely 1 per cent. of the total capital, share, and loan. Remembering this, and that in the early days of the movement it was thought by many, as indeed it is still thought by some, inconsistent with discipline for an employee to be also one of those who direct the manager, it is little surprising that a rule was adopted excluding employees from the committee. The chief pity is that it still stands when the worker-committeemen have done so well in many societies, and when at Hebden Bridge itself the workers own 21 per cent. of the total capital and over 25 per cent. of

the share capital alone.¹ This rule prevails in a number of societies, and is considered similar to that excluding civil servants from Parliament.

To return to the distribution of profit, still taking the Leicester Boot Society as a typical case. Although workers only figure for 40 per cent. directly, it is they chiefly who get the benefit of the various common funds—provident (for old-age pensions, etc.), educational, special service, etc.,—and, in fact, (as in this society the committee consists almost wholly of workers,) of all except the 20 per cent. to customers and that part of the 10 per cent. to capital which goes to outsiders—a diminishing proportion as the workers' capital accumulates. As to these exceptions, perhaps more powerful than the abstract reasons for them given above is the business desire to interest all parties in the fullest success of the venture, especially to interest the stores and so secure their custom. Further, it is necessary to offer capital terms which will attract it without being too burdensome to the society. To take the case of a store investing in several productive societies, clearly if only a bare commercial rate of interest were offered, there would be nothing to compensate for risk—that is, for losses sustained in those of its investments which were unsuccessful. On the other hand, if a high rate of interest were offered, it would be a burden upon societies only moderately successful, and would perhaps destroy the character of them by preventing there being any net profit to distribute to the workers. It is, therefore, not unusual now to offer a moderate fixed interest plus a share of the net profits. This share is no burden on any society, while in case of prosperity it affords some compensation for less fortunate investments. It amounts, in fact, so far as it goes, to a perfectly simple means of mutual assurance among those co-operative ventures adopting the rule.

We have seen, then, that on its narrowest material side co-partnership gives the worker, in addition to his trade-union rate

¹ The workers have voting power enough to alter the rule if they choose; and since the above was written the society has passed a resolution accepting the principle of admitting a worker on the committee.

of wages, a chance of earning and saving for his old age a profit amounting very often to from 5 to 7½ per cent. upon his wages, and of benefiting by provident and other funds. What of its other economic, and of its social and moral effects? First, it makes employment much more regular, for in case of depression these societies do not discharge a certain proportion of workers, but divide what work there is equitably. Secondly, it identifies the interest of the worker with the common interest of the society which employs him, and thereby promotes a public spirit, economy, and good workmanship. We have detailed evidence of this: one secretary says that in case of work being done unsatisfactorily the remark is often heard in the shop, "We can't turn out a thing like that." Next, the risk of strikes and lock-outs is almost entirely removed, first because the worker knows the exact rights of any dispute, and the society knows that he knows; and secondly, because the workers themselves have a large if not a controlling voice in the direction of affairs. As a matter of fact, instead of having labour disputes of their own, these societies are sometimes the very backbone of their unions. The individual workers pay their contributions, while the societies afford exact information as to costs and prices, and provide a place where trade leaders and men "victimized" after strikes may work, and where during a strike considerable numbers of men could find employment. Moreover, there is at least one instance of a society which belongs to the employers' association in its trade, and sends its representative to sit at their board and argue the case of the men.

Co-partnership, again, does much to promote happiness and intelligence by giving men an interest in and a knowledge of their own affairs, by its educational and social work, and by opening up new chances of advancement through social service. Further, through all these channels it raises the moral tone, and is in particular the pronounced enemy of drunkenness and gambling. The need of excitement is the mainspring of these vices, and it is therefore a question how far they arise from men being so largely deprived of the legitimate excitement of managing their own affairs. "You would not," says another secretary, "find

one-tenth part as much gambling in our shop as in others." And lastly, through the semi-public nature of the proceedings, the freedom of criticism and the fact that these societies usually produce for consumers organized in the store to protect their own interests, the system does not lend itself well to adulteration, shoddy, or any underhand proceedings.

However, one tale is good until another is told. Our readers may fairly ask what is to be said against this system, and why it has not spread more rapidly? First and comprehensively, it is said that the whole thing is a failure;¹ that the societies spring up like mushrooms, linger awhile, the members quarrelling among themselves most of the time, and finally disappear. We think the facts and figures given above afford a pretty conclusive answer so far as late years go, and while admitting the failure of the early experiments in our movement, as in the Store,² the Trade Union, and practically every such movement, we would insist that only through these early experiments have the true lines for success been discovered. Yet the extent of these early failures was by no means as great as is often represented. In 1883 there was published a list of 224 alleged failures of Co-operative Productive Societies which had been registered from 1850 to 1880. Examination of the official records showed that of these only twenty-four had been co-partnership workshops giving a definite share of profit to labour; two or three others established some philanthropic or educational funds for their workers, but did not go beyond this; forty-four had been consumers' workshops, *i.e.* stores employing labour for mere wages; while all the rest were simply joint-stock concerns, registered as industrial societies to escape stamp and other charges. These figures have been repeatedly published and never challenged. We have said that since 1880 the proportion of successes has certainly increased, and it is steadily increasing. The public, however, have been impressed by the failure

¹ We have only space here to answer general objections. Criticisms on particular societies we hope to deal with elsewhere.

² Throughout this article only working-class stores are referred to.

of certain early experiments much talked of in their day, and it may take another ten years to get the real present facts generally known.

Another form which this allegation of failure takes, is a demonstration that co-partnership cannot succeed because of three obstacles: (1) want of capital; (2) want of custom; (3) want of administrative discipline. Now, it may be admitted that these, or at least the first two, together with want of knowledge of co-operative principles, and want of business training, are the causes which retard the spread of the movement. No doubt they have also in certain cases produced failure, and are always dangers to be guarded against, but they have not prevented considerable progress already, and they become less and less insuperable daily. Workmen in their various organizations have pretty well learnt the necessity of discipline: the stores afford in many cases a market, especially now that the existing productive societies influence more and more those in their own neighbourhood and others sympathizing with them in principle.

The question of capital requires a fuller treatment. In the main it is to the accumulation of working-class savings that we must look. As there are many industries carried on with from £20 to £50 capital per employee, it is quite possible for workers to start in these with only such capital as they can put together themselves, or get fellow-workers in the trade, Trades Unions, Co-operative Stores, or other sympathizers to invest with them. Indeed, when one comes to stores, one meets with accumulations of capital so great that with proper arrangement they would enable almost any trade to be started. Five million pounds are said to be available for investment in the hands of the stores, and certainly still larger sums of working-class savings might be had by them did they not systematically discourage their deposit for very surfeit of money. Hitherto the stores, whose capital is withdrawable, have not seen their way to take up largely the non-withdrawable shares of productive societies, where there is necessarily some risk, and the possible gain is not large as capital is at present remunerated by them. We do,

however, find stores and federations of stores themselves going into productive businesses which require large amounts of capital, and, as we have already seen, there is nothing to prevent the original capitalists in such cases, or in other established businesses, applying the principle of co-partnership with mutual advantage. It is, however, alleged that even should they do so, the growing amount of capital required makes it practically impossible in the staple industries of the country—the textile, iron and coal trades—“for the workers or for any section of the workers in a factory, mine, or workshop to become the sole capitalists of the concern in which they work.”¹ This is no doubt true at present, but it is beside the mark, for co-partnership does not require that they should be the sole or necessarily the chief capitalists in such cases, only that they should own a substantial share. Let us, however, take the instance given us—“the moderate instance of a spinning factory with a capital of £60,000 and employing 200 workers.” In the first place, at least five or six societies employing from £200 to £300 and even more per worker do already practise co-partnership. Nor is it at all impossible that the employees of such a society should become owners of a substantial share of the capital. A man earning about £1 a week and receiving a dividend of 9d. in the £ upon his wages, which makes £2 annually, would, by allowing this to accumulate at the usual 5 per cent., have £25 in the shares of his society at the end of ten years, and this is already a substantial sum. He would have £100 at the end of twenty-six years, £200 at the end of thirty-seven years; so that he would have a considerable sum to provide an old-age pension by the time he was no longer able to work, without saving one penny from his trade-union rate of wages or even any dividends he might have at the Co-operative Store. Without pretending, therefore, that it is possible for workmen to start such businesses at present with their individual savings, it is clear that when established by the collective savings of their organizations or by others, they can come rapidly to own a substantial part of

¹ Miss B. Potter (Mrs. Sidney Webb), *Co-operative Movement*, p. 151.

the capital. At Hebden Bridge¹ we have seen it has actually happened: the workers there, men, women, and children, hold an average of about £28 of capital per head, though, as their numbers have steadily grown from 18 to 290 in twenty-three years, most of them cannot have been employed long.

It should, however, be noted, that in the Labour Association's evidence before the Labour Commission, about 4000 workers in the 47 societies were found to be working with an average capital of £88 a head, being £46 in shares, £36 in loans, and £6 in reserve funds. This includes some of the large capitals above referred to, and that it was fairly adequate is shown by the 20 per cent. profit realized. It is evident, therefore, that an enormous field exists in which the capital required is by no means so large as to form any real obstacle, and that in other cases where it is a serious or complete bar to starting with the money of individual workmen only it need not prevent the subsequent application of co-partnership principles. If to the annual accumulation in stores of some millions of working-class capital were added the profits of the more lightly capitalized industries, results might soon be reached now hardly more conceivable than the present £50,000,000 annual turn-over of British Co-operation was, when the twenty-eight poor weavers of Rochdale took down their shutters not quite fifty years ago.

Another objection to co-partnership, and one of a different character, is directed against the "independent" position of our societies, and their giving their workers a direct interest in the profit of their own labour. It declares "utterly unwarranted" the claim of "the Christian Socialists and their latter-day followers" to be putting "industry upon an ethical basis." They "appeal," we read, "to the desire for personal independence and personal gain among the workers. . . . The idea of the service of one man by another is to be repudiated."² The supporters of co-partnership no doubt do appeal to the desire for independence—independence combined with voluntary discipline—and no doubt do think it makes right-doing easier when a

¹ *Vide*, p. 307, *supra*.

² Potter, *Co-operative Movement*, p. 154.

man has an appreciable interest in doing right instead of in the reverse; but it is absolutely incorrect to say that "the service of one man by another is to be repudiated." The desire for independence we believe to be one of the deepest rooted in human nature, and by no means incompatible with concerted action and order, so long as organization is not unnecessarily extended, centralized, and machine-like. We do not think it would be generally successful to assume as the basis of a system that the ordinary man would work his best, in matters by no means exciting, for the benefit of a whole community so widespread that his share of control is quite imaginary, and that almost all its members are unknown to him or even the objects of his prejudices, while his own or any other individual's share of advantage from his exertions is inappreciable. Yet this is what the great centralized bodies manufacturing on the consumers' theory seem to expect of their employees. The finest spirits might rise to this height, but for them there will be always opportunities. On the other hand, the worker in a co-partnership workshop is labouring both for his own interest—which is no ignoble thing, since it includes wife and children—and at the same time for a community's, the community of his fellow-workers whom he meets day by day, whom he lives among and knows familiarly. Surely this is a more hopeful thing to ask; and surely a system is to be judged, not by those good qualities which it wildly takes for granted, but by those which it is likely to draw out, as a basis perhaps for further developments by-and-by. The real issue between the two systems is this: autonomy and responsibility on the one hand, centralization and a mechanical subservience on the other. For how can you decentralize administration unless you decentralize responsibility, that is, profit and loss, at the same time?

It must not for a moment be supposed we are deprecating a federation of consumers entering upon manufacture, on condition that they give the actual workers—as the "A. & H.," the Glasgow United Baking Society, and the Scottish Wholesale have—a direct interest in results, and the right to become members with a direct voice in the management. Though experience seems to

show that their combination may easily be too large and too centralized for that economy which should yield a great fund to raise the material condition of labour, yet the organized consumers have many advantages for starting industries; especially their control of capital and custom. There would seem to be a very wide and legitimate field in production open to them where they may advance the cause with remarkable rapidity. Nor need they hinder the progress of producers' associations; indeed, the line between a consumers' society and a producers' would become almost indistinct, the former having admitted the workers to co-partnership, and the latter admitting, as they do, the stores to take up capital and giving a share of profits to the organized consumers. The constitution would no longer be exclusively consumers' co-operation nor producers', but a harmonizing of the two. Such, in fact, are the constitutions of many existing co-partnership societies.

A final objection is sometimes raised to co-partnership as a cure for our industrial ills, that even supposing the country covered with such businesses, they must either compete among themselves and perpetuate the ills they profess to cure, or combine to impose price and quality upon the public. The latter possibility is so remote that we might safely leave it for a future generation to deal with, even did we not already see that the organized societies of consumers, with their large interests in the co-partnership societies, their great influence as customers, and their power of starting manufactures for themselves, must at once prevent such a thing. As to competition among the societies, the two worst ills now attending competition, viz. adulteration and sweating, would be guarded against—one by the consumers' associations, and the other by the labour organizations, but still more by the working-class constitution of the societies themselves. In this connection it is worth noting that while some theorists on trades unionism have attacked co-partnership as a hostile influence, many of the chief leaders of practical trades unionism are its warm supporters. In his evidence before the Labour Commission, Mr. Inskip, after describing the Leicester Boot Society, of which he was one of the

founders, and declaring it "one of the objects of our Union to start productive co-operative societies," said, "After five years' practical experience, I believe co-operative production, based on the partnership of the workers, would remove nearly all existing difficulties between capital and labour."

With a view not so much to avoid any possible evils of competition among the societies, as to gain the positive economies of buying and selling in common, and generally of a common organization for common interests, there have long been efforts towards federation. Indeed, one such federation has existed for twelve years, but as it extends to all the societies, even in such different trades as fustian-cutting and padlock-making, it has naturally found only a limited field of practicable work. There is only one industry in which the societies are sufficiently numerous to make federation a practical necessity—the boot and shoe trade,—and in this a promising subsidiary federation has recently been formed. Other trades will, no doubt, follow as the need arises, and meanwhile a constant growth may be expected in the usefulness of the central federation.

We have already indicated many points at which the societies even now help the elevation of the worker, and we need not take room to show how much more powerfully they would act if they were numerous and federated. One point, however, the unemployed question, we must touch upon. During the late cotton-spinning strike, the Burnley Weaving Society, employing two hundred hands, produced an appreciable effect upon the condition of its district by continuing work when the high price of yarn entailed a loss, and a private employer would have stopped. Again, our societies make a practice of dividing a short supply of work among all the workers, and not discharging the unfortunate 10 or 20 per cent. who would too often suffer under the present system. Imagine the extent of this multiplied a hundredfold, and it becomes of national importance.

It will be asked, Do we then expect this form of industrial organization to become universal? We are not rash enough to say that; but as a matter of speculation, while recognizing the

spheres of individualism and of state socialism, we certainly believe that from its perfect flexibility, its subservience to the common good, and its harmony with the higher side of human nature, voluntary collectivism has a great future before it. As a matter of the practical present, we merely say that there is a very, very wide field in which co-partnership can, and we think certainly will, be applied. We hold to the belief which Mill¹ had in the future of co-operative production, and we think it has been justified since his day by the progress achieved against great obstacles.

It is to the workers themselves we look for progress. It can only come in proportion as they desire it, and are willing to work and make present sacrifices for it: but in order that they may desire it, they must know of it; and in order that some obstacles may be removed from their path, the public must be stirred up to knowledge and sympathy, and to a sense of their duty as purchasers to buy by preference goods made under the best and most elevating conditions.² To do all that tends in this direction is the work of the Labour Association. The exhibition of co-partnership products held at the Crystal Palace during the great National Co-operative Festival every August, is perhaps one of its most important pieces of work; but all the year round it is busy with lectures, discussions, interviews, conferences, the issue of literature, correspondence, advising societies and those forming societies, drafting rules and what not. In this work there is ample scope, and indeed great need, for men and women of any class who will help.

HENRY VIVIAN.

ANEURIN WILLIAMS.

¹ *Political Economy*, bk. iv., ch. 7, "On the Probable Future of the Working Classes."

² Some friends of the Labour Association have established in Central London a dépôt for the sale of Co-operative productions. This is at 36, Hart Street, Bloomsbury, close to the British Museum. The Labour Association (9, John Street, Adelphi, London, W.C.), being a purely propagandist body, is not itself connected with the dépôt.

TRICKS WITH TEXTILES.

THE perusal of an article in the last number of the *Economic Review*, which attracted wide attention, led a disillusionized householder to express a hearty wish that the heading could be altered from, "Three Months *in* the Milk Trade," to "Three Months (hard) *for* the Milk Trade." As milk is a food, this desire may yet be consummated, for the adulteration of food is a criminal offence. But as regards our present subject, the law has been curiously oblivious of, or tender to, the textile trades; and, until the covert adulteration of textiles is made illegal, one of the most rampant forms of commercial dishonesty may be expected to flourish with impunity.

It is therefore important to awaken public interest in an amendment of the law, by exposing some of the deceptions which are practised upon consumers of textiles. So large a subject might fill a volume, or even a series of volumes; within the limits of a review article it is only possible to give some idea of the astounding ingenuity which is perverted to the end of deceiving the public. "Prisoner," said the judge, "you have been endowed with all the ability and qualifications which would have ensured your success in any honourable career which was open to you, instead of which you go about the country stealing chickens." The same skill, thought, and energy which have been misspent on making goods appear to be that which they are not, might, if devoted to the manufacture of honest goods, have kept our country in the forefront of the world's commerce to a greater extent than is at present the case, and might have obtained for British textiles a reputation which would have more than counteracted the meretricious cheapness of dishonest foreign manufactures. But in too many instances the British manufacturer has set the bad example,

or has joined in the competition to produce goods whose appearance is intended to deceive.

Probably the majority of traders would be honest if they could, but how is an honest trader to live if an unscrupulous rival attracts the former's customers by spurious cheapness? By purging trade of dishonest practices, would-be honest traders will be saved from the alternative of copying the tricks of unscrupulous competitors or of losing their customers. The Merchandise Marks Act, 1887, provides penalties for "false trade descriptions;" but the Act is to a great extent a dead letter, as there is no public authority to put it in force. It is true that the Board of Trade has acquired powers to prosecute under the Act; but it is exceedingly difficult to get the Board to move, in fact impossible for private persons.

"False trade descriptions," moreover, by no means include all the dishonest tricks which are played with textiles. There may be tacit, as well as written or spoken misrepresentation. The mixture of a cheap constituent, such as cotton, with silk or wool, can be so cleverly disguised as to deceive even an expert; and *in default of a correct description*, the producer or vendor can no more be absolved from an attempt to take in the consumer than if the material had been falsely described. The trader who buys to sell again is very often an expert, or has at least some acquaintance with market values, and he probably knows the nature of the goods by the price. But this fact does not absolve the producer from responsibility for what is practically a conspiracy between him and the middle-man to deceive the consumer by the appearance of the article. It is useless to argue that the principle of *caveat emptor* should prevail, and that the consumer should know by the price of the article what he is getting. Even if the price be abnormally low, most consumers are ignorant of market values, and are guided by the appearance of what they buy. Nor is it any excuse for the producer or vendor of these false-faced articles that the public insists upon cheapness. If a man chooses to sell cheap textiles, *he should be compelled to describe them accurately as what they are*—silk and cotton, wool and cotton,

linen and cotton, or what not. It should be made illegal to sell, or to offer or expose for sale, textile mixtures without a clear and accurate description; and the onus should rest upon each vendor through whose hands the goods have passed, to show that he gave such a description of them in his invoice, and whenever he had occasion to describe the goods.

Such a law would be welcomed by a number of producers and distributors, who would gladly describe their goods honestly if their less scrupulous rivals were compelled to do the same. Each trick in the trade has originated with some unscrupulous person who wanted to steal a dishonest advantage; and his trade rivals have followed suit in self-defence.

The writer has dwelt upon this point of "tacit" misrepresentation because, while some of the tricks with textiles which will be mentioned would come within the purview of existing laws—notably of the Merchandise Marks Act, 1887—goods which deceive only by their appearance are not necessarily illegal, if not "falsely described." There are many ways of playing tricks with textiles besides false descriptions and false appearance, but as these methods particularly concern the public, for whom this article is written, prominence has been given to them in the above remarks.

In recent years public attention has been especially drawn to the adulteration of wool with cotton. As an instance of the extent to which this has been carried on in the woollen underwear trade, a leading firm in the City of London was compelled some two years since to publish an apology for having sold, labelled "pure wool," a mixture containing 30 per cent. of cotton! As cotton is very much cheaper than wool, the great saving thus effected in their cost made it possible to sell these "pure wool" (!) articles at an apparently low price. There was a large sale for them, and, no doubt, until the trick was exposed it was a very profitable one. Nor has the exposure, probably, much affected the reputation of the firm with the trade. It was looked upon by some as a smart trick, the cotton having been so cleverly concealed as to escape detection for years. A variation of this tune was played by a Leicester

firm, which made up goods containing about 50 per cent. of cotton, and extensively advertised them as "Natural Wool." This was put a stop to only a few months ago, the Board of Trade having caused the firm to be convicted of a false trade description under the Merchandise Marks Act, 1887. The penalty was £5, a sum which probably did not nearly represent the thousandth part of the profits earned on the class of goods falsely described.

Let us hear what a trade organ has to say on the subject. The *Textile Manufacturer* writes:—

"In these days of keen competition manufacturers devise all sorts of mixtures in order to produce cheap goods, and by skilful manipulation in the blending of the different fibres, endeavour to make them appear of much finer quality than they really are. Cheap goods and adulteration always go hand in hand ; they are inseparable, one being the cause of the other."

As to "how it is done," the following information is taken from the *Textile Recorder*:—

"Before the yarn is spun the cotton is so thoroughly mixed with the wool that only an expert could detect the presence of the former ; and when a material made from this mixture comes to be 'finished' it has quite the appearance of wool. Another method is to twist woollen and cotton threads together. Cotton is very largely used as warp, with a woollen weft ; such different materials as serges, doeskins, meltons, are thus made, and it is an object with manufacturers to conceal the warp as much as possible and to display the weft. The use of cotton in the proportion of one-third, or even of as much as two-thirds, of the whole web must be termed an abuse ; as also the practice of calling such materials 'worsted.'"

Here are two samples of ingenuity collated from trade journals:—

(1) "A machine is described for affixing to a varnished webbing the dust of any fibre, giving to the webbing the appearance of the material—wool or otherwise—of which the fibre dust is composed."

(2) "A material came out some time since as a 'Winter Jersey' cloth, and was sold at a very low figure. The face appeared all that could be desired ; the texture was even and regular ; the feel was good ; in substance it compared with the best Jersey cloth, made with a good

backing. Further minute examination, however, revealed that the face and the backing were not interwoven, and by taking hold of one corner it was possible to roll the face nicely off the back, showing that the former consisted of a fine twill-made single Jersey cloth, pasted upon a stout felt as backing. Felt being naturally much less expensive than a woven cloth, the cheapness of this 'Winter Jersey' cloth was explained. Doubtless more than one consumer was pained to find the surface of his new overcoat rolling off after he had been out in a shower."

No article on Tricks with Textiles would be complete without a reference to shoddy, by which is here meant all kinds of re-used woollen materials torn to pieces, combed, and re-spun. As this process is not conducive to length of yarn, shoddy is often little better than the fibre dust alluded to above. Such are, however, the resources of science, that shoddy enters to a surprising degree into woollen manufactures, and these by no means of the lowest class. The wide difference in cost between old woollen rags and new sheep's wool has proved a great stimulant to the introduction by spinners and by weavers of a percentage of shoddy into yarns and materials. Of course the lasting quality of such materials is greatly reduced, as the shoddy falls away on very small provocation; and the use of shoddy in woollen materials, unless expressly described, must be condemned as dishonest.

The *Textile Manufacturer* is responsible for the following:—

"Hundreds of tons of (woollen) rags are sold at Dewsbury and Ossett every week, which are used for shoddy, which is manufactured in the Dewsbury district. Rags come to Dewsbury from all parts of the world, a great many coming from abroad. Some of the Dewsbury firms pay as much as £3000 to £5000 a year for carriage alone. We are informed by a correspondent that he has been asked by a Spanish manufacturer of shoddy and mungo [mungo is an especially low grade of shoddy] whether he knows of a process by which wool derived from rags could be in such a manner increased in volume as raw cotton can be by a similar process (merzerising), without suffering in quality, and with the result of obtaining a lustre and softness which would make it valuable."

Let us now note a few typical tricks with textiles which only concern the consumer indirectly, but which are eminently

characteristic of the commercial dishonesty protested against in the opening remarks of this article. The following letter, addressed to a Manchester merchant, was published some time ago in a trade journal, ordering—

“ — bundles (10 lb. each) No. 24's of your quality —, at the price of — per lb., by falsifying [he does not mince matters], viz. marking 22's as 24's. If you can so falsify, send it on ; and it is, of course, understood that the bundle must contain 48 knots of 5 hanks each, just as if the yarn were real No. 24's. Send further — bundles No. 12's which you will mark No. 14's at the price of — per lb. ; and, of course, here also the bundle must contain 28 knots, just as if it were real 14's.”

For the information of outsiders, it may be explained that two hanks in single yarn generally make a difference in price of $\frac{1}{4}d.$ per lb. ; and it is evident that manufacturers who refuse to lend themselves to such deceptions are at a great disadvantage in competing against less scrupulous rivals.

Water is another cheap adulterant employed in connection with textiles ; and, under the heading of “Damp in Yarn,” the following remarks on cotton and water appeared in the *Textile Manufacturer* :—

“ Our attention has recently been drawn to the important question of yarn adulteration by a letter from a foreign correspondent, stating that ten-pound bundles of yarn imported from England, after being stored some days in our correspondent's factory, lose from 2 to 5 per cent. of weight. The loss of this firm has been great. There can be no doubt that at all the large spinning centres, especially in Oldham, there is a systematic and constant ‘conditioning,’ ‘purifying,’ or, plainly stated, adulteration, of yarn with water. It is regrettable that such a system has gained ground. Damping is practised by spinners of almost all classes of yarns.”

Cotton spinners would perhaps plead that they are only doing as they are done by, for Richard Marsden, in his book on cotton spinning, remarks that of late years cotton (*i.e.* the raw material) has been greatly adulterated, and that spinners have suffered correspondingly heavy losses from this cause. He says that sand and water are the two chief adulterants. The sand remains

in the machines; but the water evaporates, and is called "invisible loss :"—

Little drops of water, little grains of sand
Make the cotton heavy, meet the cheap demand.

But there is a further refinement in adulterating cotton which is literally more deeply rooted than the watering-can process. An article in the *Textile Recorder* on "Adulteration of Indian Cotton" states :—

"The planter mixes the seeds of short and long-stapled cotton, and then grows both qualities in the same field. Now, short-stapled cotton yields a greater production per acre, and being thus used to adulterate the long-staple, commands a higher price than its intrinsic value would warrant."

Another form of textile-trick is the sending out cotton piece-goods folded in such a manner as to deceive the purchaser. The English Consul-General at Salonica, Mr. J. E. Blunt, reported :—

"White shirtings for this market are usually sent out in from 40- to 42½-yard pieces, made up in as many folds of one yard each. But certain houses have been sending out pieces which measure only from 36 to 38 yards, but plaited in the same number of folds as the goods of genuine length. To the detriment of honourable houses, and to the injury of people who come into Salonica to make their purchases, these pieces have been passed off as being 40 to 42 yards in length, the terms stamped upon them of 40 or 42 *folds* being a mere blind."

Similar frauds have been reported from Bengazi, the port of Tripoli, and it is stated that "these frauds have in many quarters brought Lancashire goods into disrepute."

Over-sizing is a common means of adulterating cottons; and the British reputation for commercial honesty has suffered greatly in the East in consequence of the weighting of the fabric with useless substances, much of which necessarily disappears in washing, leaving the fabric much lighter and poorer than it appeared to be when bought. In fact, these goods are made to sell, not to wear; and such a practice is not only very dishonest, but absurdly short-sighted.

An analogous practice is the excessive weighting of silk in dyeing by manufacturers, against which silk-producers in France have had to strongly protest, as the abuse was damaging their reputation. By the aid of chemistry a peculiar and distinct industry was gradually developed among silk-spinners and weavers, and dyed silks have been weighted as much as 100 to 150 per cent., and black silks from 150 to 300 per cent., and possibly more. It was proposed to pass a law requiring each piece of silk brought into the market to have stated on it the percentage of increase in weight, and the composition of the materials used. By this means a buyer could know the proportion of silk which he bought, in addition to tin, iron, and tanning materials.

These facts speak for themselves. If any further comment is needed, it is afforded in the following extract from an article which appeared in the *Nottingham Daily Express* of October 20, 1893, *à propos* of the case alluded to above, in which a manufacturer was convicted and fined for describing as "Natural Wool" goods containing 50 per cent. of cotton:—

"The real point is that the maker of the honest article requires protection, and those members of the general public without common sense also need protection. No doubt the public are themselves partially to blame for the loose morality of trade customs. The general consumer is eaten up with his love of a cheap article, and his desire to make a bargain. He wants the best articles at the lowest possible figure. He knows what are the best articles, and he asks for them. The shopman fools him to the top of his bent. The manufacturer fools the shopman, and in course of time every article that a man has in his shop is ticketed as the very best of its kind, and the trader salves his conscience by the mental reservation, 'at the price.' This may be, and probably is, the result of unlimited competition, but that it is a pernicious result no one will deny. It is characteristic of all departments of business all over the world. It is started by the manufacturer who does not stickle at a modest adulteration, and it is fostered by the inordinate love of cheapness and the extreme credulity of the general consumer, who, moreover, cannot be expected to know of what every article he buys is made. Thousands of articles are too cheap to be honest. People expect a Cheap Jack to do violence to the truth when he starts his prices. It is part of his business, and

they would be surprised if he told the truth. But we should be sorry to see the Cheap Jack's ethics introduced as the ordinary ethics of commerce. The tendency is certainly in that direction. Most people must have noticed that whenever an appeal is made to a 'custom of the trade' the practice in question is invariably either doubtful, very doubtful, or downright dishonest."

How can "the maker of the honest article" and "members of the general public without common sense" be afforded the protection which the *Nottingham Daily Express* considers necessary? As already stated, the Board of Trade is difficult to move, nor is it surprising that a Government Department with manifold duties should be reluctant to assume those of a public prosecutor. The responsibility of enforcing the Food and Drugs Adulteration Act rests with municipal bodies, who are empowered to employ inspectors to take samples, etc. This duty, however, is not unfrequently neglected—in some cases no inspectors have been appointed—and protection for consumers of textiles cannot be looked for from municipalities. Chambers of Commerce naturally suggest themselves in this connection, but they usually include amongst their members the leading manufacturers in the town, and *quis custodiet ipsos custodes*? Moreover, Chambers of Commerce seldom possess corporate funds, and are therefore without the means to incur expenditure which prosecutions might entail. The most satisfactory solution would be the establishment of a State department for undertaking prosecutions of all kinds, whenever a *prima facie* case of infraction of the law is brought to its notice.

What is immediately practicable is an association of those members of the textile trades who sincerely desire that dishonest practices should cease, and who are resolved that offenders shall be punished, and the law amended where necessary. Such a "Vigilance Committee" would soon frighten the unscrupulous trader into discontinuing his frauds upon the public, and his dishonest competition. It is satisfactory to note that the leading trade journals are sound on this question; but so long as they confine themselves to denouncing dishonest

practices in parliamentary, not to say timid, terms, and to appealing to the honour of traders, the rogue who is turning a dishonest penny will only laugh in his sleeve. How bad the state of things is may be gathered from the cautious statement of the *Warehouseman and Draper* of June 2, 1894, that "the strict all-round enforcement of the law as it stands would be a more serious thing than can be contemplated without dismay in the existing order of trade."

This remarkable admission lends great force to the plea for prompt and efficacious measures which will indeed dismay the evil-doer, but which will relieve honest traders from the alternative of "doing as others do," or of succumbing to unscrupulous competitors; while consumers would soon be cured of the rage for unnatural cheapness if truthful descriptions of cheap goods were made compulsory. The trade journals would render a great and lasting service if they would use their powerful influence to further the formation of a strong "Textiles Vigilance Association," for promoting morality and legality in the textile trades.

ONE IN THE TRADE.

TWO DIALOGUES ON SOCIALISM.

I.

(*MANLY, a Non-Socialist Democrat. WILLIAMS, an old Christian Socialist.*)

M. Don't you see, my dear Mr. Williams, that Socialism is nonsense?

W. Well, I suppose I must be very obtuse, for, after over a good half-century's thought upon the matter, I have not yet made the discovery. Perhaps I am not yet too old to learn. Please tell me why?

M. Why? Of course Socialism means the confiscation of all private property, the carrying on of all industry by means of State workshops, the doling out to each individual of a subsistence portion, and compulsory labour.

W. Where do you find all this?

M. Well, I suppose what I have said about represents the Fabian programme.

W. I must leave you to settle that with the Fabians themselves, many of whom, at least, I take it, would disclaim a good deal of what you attribute to them. But do you suppose the Fabians invented Socialism, that you should identify it with them?

M. Of course old Robert Owen's parallelograms were called Socialism, and various Continental systems, but no one thinks anything of all that nowadays.

W. How long do you suppose Socialism has existed on the earth?

M. Well, even if you take in all those obsolete systems, I suppose not much more than a century.

W. Not so much, if the thing Socialism dates from Owen,

since he only became manager of the New Lanark Mills in 1800, and there began to put in application what was afterwards termed Socialism. But it is only the name that is new; the thing is as old as society itself.

M. What do you mean?

W. I mean that you should look the word straight in the face, and see that "Socialism" means the "ism" of being social, as "formalism" means the "ism" of being formal, or "despotism" the "ism" of being a despot. Were there no forms before the word "formalism" was invented, no despots before "despotism" was?

M. Well, well, I must own it looks to me something like a *parvenu* buying his ancestors ready-made at a picture-dealer's, when you claim for this new-fangled Socialism such an antiquity. If the thing is so old, how came it that the name was never wanted before?

W. I should say that the reaction from the intense individualism of the French Revolution was what called forth the need of the new word. At any rate there it is. And don't you see that "society," "social," "socialism," and "socialist" all strictly correspond with each other—that if Social means that which pertains to society, the meaning of Socialism is involved again in that, so that neither those who claim nor those who disclaim the term "Socialist" have the right to shut it up within any narrower sense than that of its filiation?

M. Why do you make so much of a mere word?

W. Words are broad and true things, which by conceit, by ignorance, by prejudice, by conventionality we are always narrowing into falsehood. It is only by stretching them to their due extent that we can reason profitably by means of them.

M. But, surely, words vary in meaning from age to age, and Socialism to-day may mean something different from what it did in Robert Owen's day?

W. Words expressing an idea should always expand with the expansion of the idea itself. Think how the idea of "society" has widened since, in its Latin original, it meant simply a partnership

between two or three! So with that idea must the words "social," "socialism," which grow out of it, have widened and widen yet.

M. Do you assert that Socialism does not mean what I have said in the mouths of some of its prominent, I might say, most prominent advocates?

W. Dinner means for one man a hunch of bread, for another three courses and a dessert. Can you confine the word to either application of it?

M. I am tired of this talk about words. Let us come to things. You call yourself, I now understand, a Socialist. Do you or do you not advocate the confiscation of private property, universal State industry, with subsistence portions for each and compulsory labour?

W. I have never advocated any one of these things as an object, still less all of them together. I utterly deny your right to treat Socialism as a mere combination of these four elements. Still, I doubt if any one of them need be the hobgoblin you make of it.

M. What! you would approve of the confiscation of private property?

W. What is confiscation? The bringing of something into the public treasury, the *fiscus*. Is not all taxation, general or local, confiscation *pro tanto*? If you reckon the national income at seven hundred and fifty millions, you will find that more than a tenth of that (putting out of account the post-office, and telegraph service, and crown-lands) is "confiscated" every year for the needs of the community. And does any one doubt that the proportion is a rising one? Can you be blind to the fact that, in exact proportion to the spread of civilization, more matters at first of private concernment become public matters, to be provided for by the public at the cost of private persons? The savage defends himself against robbers, fights his own battles. The civilized man pays a policeman, a soldier, a sailor, or if he doesn't pay is compelled to pay in person even if not in cash, finds his goods seized and sold, is sent to prison. Surely that is confiscation of private property with a vengeance!

M. Of a portion of it, only of a portion of it.

W. It is a well-known historic fact that in the latter days of the Roman Empire the land in a great part of Italy had gone out of cultivation, owing to the pressure of taxation.

M. Ah! but that was an age of despotism. And Socialism itself, I look upon as essentially despotic.

W. Italy is no longer a despotically ruled country, and yet there appear to be regions in it where taxation has come to trench on the very lives of the peasantry. Even with us, at the present day, land is said to be going out of cultivation in some places, through the burden of the rates. But, indeed, true Socialism—the embodiment of the spirit of partnership in all things—can never be despotic except against those who show themselves altogether unpartnerly—the murderer, the profligate, the thief, the wilful idler.

M. And do you really think that the Government workshops of Socialism will not multiply idlers? Look at those of Louis Blanc in 1848.

W. Louis Blanc declared repeatedly during his life, not only that the "Ateliers Nationaux" were not of his founding, but were established in opposition to him. It is, no doubt, the fact that from the first they were organized by and placed officially under the control of the Minister of Public Works, Marie, an anti-Socialist Republican. But are there no Government workshops among ourselves—ay, and in every civilized country? What do you say to our dockyards, our ordnance factories, our small-arms factories, our gunpowder factory, our army-clothing factory (this last paying last year £67,000 in wages, and £230,000 for materials)? Are these all failures? Do you know that the last, in particular, is a splendid moral success? That it has practically, as far as Government work at least is concerned, put a stop to the, so to speak, compulsory immorality of fifty years ago, when a slopworker could say to the *Morning Chronicle* commissioner, "I am satisfied that there is not a young girl that works at slopwork that is virtuous, and there are some thousands in the trade?" Again, tobacco is the subject of Government manufacture throughout half the civilized world. The

most delicious cheroots I ever smoked were Government Manillas, presented by the Governor-General of the Philippines to a friend of mine. Look, again, at the post-office, telegraphs, State railways in many countries, State mines in many. The manufacture of coin is the very badge of sovereignty. With all these instances before us, do you not see that the question of State industry is simply one of more or less, and that Socialism is only involved in it so far as it is involved in the very fact of Government itself?

M. Well, but do you not see that if all industry were carried on by the State for the common benefit, allowing only a subsistence portion to each, it would destroy all stimulus to industry, and labour would have to be made compulsory?

W. To take your last point first: provided you give a sufficient breadth of meaning to the word "labour," I for one should rejoice in its being, I will not say so much made, as felt to be compulsory. "He that will not work, neither should he eat," is St. Paul's broad maxim, socialistic in the highest sense, since no man can be a true partner who simply lives upon his co-partners. And even now these words do realize themselves to some extent in all cases. The veriest loafer must do some work with legs or arms or voice to obtain a living. The richest idler must sign cheques upon his bankers before he can obtain funds for the enjoyment of his idleness. Neither of them can at all events chew his food by deputy, nor can life be permanently prolonged by the use of the stomach-pump. Give, I repeat it, a sufficiently wide sense to the word "labour," so that it shall include head-work and heart-work as well as hand-work, and I can conceive of nothing so beneficial as the spread throughout all classes of the feeling that it is the duty of all, that it is compulsory upon all, to labour. There could not be such another stimulus to industry in all conceivable branches.

M. But, my dear Mr. Williams, you must admit that the great stimulus to the production of wealth of all kinds is self-interest.

W. I deny it *in toto*, whether you use the word "wealth" in its narrowest or in its largest sense. Mere self-interest in its essential form, the interest of the human creature in its own

self alone, stops the growth of all wealth. It means robbery, lubricity, slavery, murder. The creation of wealth only begins with the respect of one man for another, the feeling that he is another's fellow, that another has rights against himself. It proceeds with increasing rapidity, in proportion as those rights are recognized, as the interest of one becomes the interest of many. Who creates most wealth—the slop-seller grinding his profit out of the starvation of his workers, or the fair-dealing employer with well-paid and trustworthy workmen, both employer and employed feeling that they have a common interest? The great stimulus to the production of wealth is the social, partnerly feeling, the fusion of self-interests in a common interest. Is there a limit beyond which that fusion cannot be carried? I, for one, do not know.

M. And I—I will not say for one, because I believe all men of common sense are with me—look upon competition, honest competition of course, as the very motive-power of human society.

W. I am glad at all events that you limit the object of your faith to honest competition. But tell me, do you think that if you and I are asking for the same leg of mutton, each for himself, that gives us a common interest?

M. No, of course, a separate one. But in the clash of these separate interests, and the endeavour of each to outbid the other, lies the butcher's prospect of gain, the incentive to his exertions.

W. And if, in the struggle to obtain the leg of mutton, you or I end by bidding more than it is worth——?

M. So much the better for the butcher.

W. Conversely, if there should be two butchers wanting to sell me a leg of mutton and I only want one, and in his anxiety to earn something one of the two butchers allows me to have his leg at less than it is worth——?

M. So much the better for you. But the worth of a thing, you know, is what it will fetch.

W. I think even plutonomists have given up that formula, which confuses worth with price. The worth of a thing to the buyer is what he can afford to pay for it, consistently with the

providing for all his other wants. Its worth to the seller is what he can afford to sell it for, under the same conditions. Now, if, through the stress of competition, buyers were to pay for everything more than they can afford, buyers would be ruined, and mere bidders would starve; and if, through the same stress, sellers were to sell everything for less than they can afford, sellers in like manner would come to ruin, and mere offerers for sale would starve. Push competition to its utmost limit, and the end is—death. In the very lowest labour markets, where wages are really starvation wages, and work is carried on under wholly insanitary conditions, competition is literally death even now.

M. Well, but where would you be without competition? To say nothing about trade, where would education be, or physical training, or politics?

W. Do not confound competition with emulation. Let every man try to do as well as or better than his neighbour; but if he merely seeks to take something away from his neighbour, there is no depth of rascality, no extreme of violence that he may not resort to.

M. Why you would put a stop to all those sports which make men of us Englishmen, from “Varsity” boat-races to cricket or football matches!

W. Not a whit. I would save them from the violence and villainy which too often disgrace them. Read Mr. Lyttelton’s sermon on “Recreation” in a lately published volume.

M. But the effect of your Socialism must be to reduce all to a dead level.

W. On the contrary, the truest Socialism must be that which calls forth the best energies of each for the common good, just as the truest partnership is that in which each partner seeks to outvie the others in his devotion to the interests of the firm, each one taking in hand that branch of the common business for which he has the greatest aptitude. In a true Socialism there should be scope for the most varied gifts.

M. See if that is the view taken of Socialism by some one whom I see coming to speak to you. Bye-bye.

[*Exit* MANLY; *enter* RICHARDS, a *Morrisian Socialist*.

II.

R. Well, Mr. Williams, it is a long time since we met.

W. Yes,—where have you been all this time?

R. Half over Europe—I can hardly say on a propagandist tour, where I had so much to learn myself. The times are ripening, my good sir, ripening fast. I shall yet live to see the obstructive figment of nationality swept away before the universality of proletarian humanity. Even anarchism with all its follies is but the torch that lights up the night till the dawning of a better day.

W. I should say there never had been a time when the nationality principle had been pushed to more extreme and absurd lengths. I am only surprised that no one among ourselves has yet suggested the cutting up of England into at least four portions, between Saxons, Anglians, Danes and Britons.

R. Mere froth upon the surface, my dear sir,—froth upon the surface.

W. May it, indeed, prove so! But is it not pitiable to see that, whilst almost every nation except our own is walling itself round against all others with protection, or at best letting down here and there the drawbridge of a commercial treaty—the protection moreover extending even to human beings as against certain races, Chinamen in America or Australasia, Jews in Russia (to say nothing of anti-Semitism in Germany, Austria, France),—the anarchist protest against nationalism should take the form of free robbery, destruction of property, murder in one's own country or in any other? Is that, too, froth upon the surface? It requires something stronger than froth to blow up both Houses of Parliament, exchanges, observatories, or even the meanest hut that shelters a human life.

R. Well, well, anarchism will die of itself when all property is common.

W. Why should it?

R. Have you read that great book, Morris and Bax on Socialism?

W. Yes—I have it indeed in my pocket—and wondered at it.

Don't misunderstand me. The subject of my wonder was, that two able men should have written such a poor book.

R. We must revert to that presently. But you will recollect that the authors point out the distinction between Civilization, which "undertakes the government of persons by direct coercion," and Socialism, which would "deal primarily with the administration of things, and only secondarily and indirectly would have to do with personal habit and conduct," so that civil law "would cease to exist," and criminal law "would tend to become obsolete," the liberty of the individual being "only limited by the natural and inevitable restrictions of individual will incident to all societies whatever." The *raison d'être* of anarchist violence would, you see, be taken away altogether.

W. I noticed the passage you refer to, but it altogether failed to impress me as it seems to have done you. In the first place, the authors appear never to have worked out for themselves the distinction between "Socialism" and "Communism," though it has been long since pointed out: Socialism starting from the person of the *socius*, the partner; Communism from the thing which has to be enjoyed in common. Socialism, as the embodiment of the partnerly spirit, must be based upon freedom, and the harmony of man with man. Communism is consistent with despotism, and, up to a certain point, with slavery itself. The slaves locked up for the night in a Cuban slave-barrack have all things there common among themselves, subject of course to the will of the strongest slave. The man who recognizes no higher will than his own, will make ducks and drakes of all so-called "natural and inevitable restrictions" upon it. Communism which is not based on a true Socialism must end in anarchy, barbarism, bestialism, death.

R. Well, old-fashioned as I knew you to be, I never imagined you to be such a bitter foe to Communism.

W. A foe to Communism? By no means. For certain purposes and within certain limits, Communism is bound up with the nature of man himself. Our two noblest senses, those of sight and hearing, are essentially communistic. Although the degree of enjoyment must vary with the individual, beautiful

sights and beautiful sounds must be enjoyed in common by all who see or hear them. On the other hand, taste and touch are essentially individual. Two men cannot eat the same oyster, or put on the same coat at once. (Smell lies on the borderland between the other two pairs, partly individual, partly communistic.) And if from the lowest strata of thought we rise to the highest, it has long since been pointed out by men far greater than myself that the Church is essentially communistic. But in this case, also, the common ownership, the common enjoyment flows essentially from the personal fellowship. "That they all may be one" is the true Socialist's divinely taught prayer. Where that unity of persons exists, those so united may indeed have, as far as practicable, "all things common."

R. Then you do think that the advance of Communism is a blessing to the world?

W. I think that the growth of common enjoyment, the extension of common property, and the increase of respect for it are among the most cheering signs of social improvement which I have witnessed in my lifetime. When flowers were first planted out in beds in the parks, old hands shrugged their shoulders, and said they would be devastated in a night. See how splendidly they bloom, year after year, in the midst of our crowded London! Have I not even lived to see rhododendrons flowering in their pots, not merely in a railed-in park, but in the open street, and in the very throng of City business, close to the Bank and the Exchange?

R. Then, from your crotchety point of view of the distinction between Socialism and Communism, I suppose you don't admit as a proposition that Socialism deals "primarily with the administration of things, and only secondarily and indirectly with personal habit and conduct"?

W. The opposition between the two, if I recollect aright, is one borrowed without acknowledgment by your authors from Auguste Comte, and characteristic, according to him, of Positivism, not of Socialism; but that matters little. What would become of a partnership in which one partner was in the habit

of grabbing all the profit, and another of knocking down all his co-partners? Would it avail anything that the books were beautifully kept, and the stock in trade admirably selected? Don't you see that persons must eternally be more than things, and that under any social conditions whatsoever the utility, the enjoyment of things must always depend upon the "personal habit and conduct" of those who use and enjoy them? Civil law, say your friends, would cease to exist. What is civil law but the rule of those great partnerships between man and man which we call the State, or by whatever name Messrs. Morris and Bax would choose to call any aggregations of men that would suit their ideal? Criminal law, say they, would tend to become obsolete. What is criminal law but the enforcement of those "restrictions of individual will" which your friends admit to be "incident to all societies whatever"? And what are those "natural and inevitable" restrictions themselves which they speak of? Surely, if anything needed to be strictly, expressly defined by them it is this. What is the meaning of "natural" in such a theory as theirs? Would an African cannibal, accustomed to buy his joint of slave-flesh in the market, accept the forbiddance of cannibalism as a "natural and inevitable restriction of human will"? Messrs. Morris and Bax would suppress marriage in favour of "an association terminable at the will of either party." Would the "natural and inevitable restrictions" to such an association include or exclude polygamy, polyandry, incest, absolute promiscuity? If a man or a woman can "associate" at will with any human creature of the other sex, why not with any number at once? Why with any for more than a day, an hour? Ay, and so drag down human society to the level of a community of dogs.

R. Well, well, that is a branch of the subject on which people are apt to go mad.

W. The madness is that of your friends the authors, who imagine that they can establish Socialism on the ruins of the family. "Property in children would cease to exist" is their euphemistic phrase for a state of things in which the love of the father for the child, of the child for the father, would gradually

die out, the child not knowing who was his father, nor the father who was his child.

R. I am afraid you are too *rococo* for me to fight the question out with you. But I want you to explain what you mean by calling Morris and Bax's book a poor one. Surely, it is full of research?

W. I owe a great deal of pleasure to Mr. William Morris as a poet. I honour him for his manful endeavour to make work artistic in the truest sense of the word. But I see nothing of any such endeavour in the book itself. As literature I should call it merely "scamped." Even as respects our own age almost everything in it appears to be taken at second hand.

R. Give an instance.

W. I will give you half a dozen. Speaking of Robert Owen, the authors say (here is the passage) that he "at last cut himself off from respectability by openly attacking respectability through its received religion (August 21, 1816), from which date onward he was scouted by all that 'society' of which he was now the declared enemy." Now, in the first place, the year of the meeting referred to is wrongly given—it was in 1817. In the next place, Owen made no attack upon respectability through "its received religion,"—by which I should think every reader of Messrs. Morris and Bax would understand Christianity. He declared that "gross errors" had been "combined with every religion that has hitherto been taught to man," and, again, that "in all the religions which have hitherto been forced on the minds of men, deep, dangerous, and lamentable principles of discussion, division, and separation have been fast entwined with all their fundamental notions," warning his hearers that if they should carry into his proposed villages "one single particle of religious intolerance or sectarian feelings of disunion and separation, maniacs only would go there to look for harmony and happiness." In other words, his attack was not on religion in itself, or on any particular religion, but simply upon the evil principles which he held to have been bound up with all religions. In the third place, even this speech did not cut him off from respectability, did not cause him to be scouted by

society. The assertion is simply a repetition of a misstatement by Mr. Sargent, already corrected by the late Mr. Lloyd Jones in his work on the *Life, Times, and Labours of Robert Owen*. If your authors had taken the trouble to examine the facts at first hand, in the publications of Robert Owen himself, they would have found that so far from being scouted by society from August 21, 1817, it was after that date that he was introduced to Louis Philippe, then Duke of Orleans, by a letter from the Duke of Kent; a year after that date that, by arrangement with Lord Castlereagh, as Foreign Minister, he presented to the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle his "memorial to the Governments of Europe and America on behalf of the working classes" (1818); nearly two years after, that the Duke of Kent presided at the meeting (June 26, 1819) for the appointment of a committee to "investigate and report upon Mr. Owen's plan," and afterwards at the meetings of the committee itself; that the committee itself included a second royal duke (the Duke of Sussex), seven M.P.s, and five "reverends;" and that such committee expressly recommended a trial of Mr. Owen's scheme. Is this being "scouted by society"?

R. Well, well—even the good Homer nods sometimes, you know.

W. Wait a bit. If we turn from English to French Socialists (Messrs. Morris and Bax give no account of any English Socialism beyond that of Owen), your authors seem, as far as I can judge, to have looked at them only through German, generally through Marxian spectacles. They refer to German works by their original titles—"Das Kapital," etc.; to French ones mostly by translations, often bad. Could any one who had handled Fourier's most important work, his *Théorie de l'Unité Universelle*—which had, indeed, at first been published as *Traité de l'Association Domestique-Agricole, ou Attraction Industrielle*,—have spoken of it as his *Treatise on the Association of Domesticity and Agriculture*? or of his *Nouveau Monde Industriel et Sociétaire*, as his *New Industrial World*? More marvellous still would be the writer's designation of Proudhon's famous *Système des Contradictions Economiques, ou Philosophie*

de la Misère, only by the second title, did one not recollect that it suited Karl Marx, for the sake of the antithesis, to adopt the latter only, in his pamphlet *Misère de la Philosophie—Réponse à la Philosophie de la Misère de M. Proudhon*. They can never have seen any work by Pierre Leroux, or they would not have divided his surname into "le Roux." They can never have read Louis Blanc's *Organisation du Travail*, or they would not have said that he put forward in it the maxim, "From each according to his capacity, to each according to his needs." The doctrine indeed is there, the "maxim" not. They speak of him as having "got the national workshops founded," but state that "Bethmont, the Minister of Trade and Agriculture, had intentionally organized them for failure." They can never have read the documents of the period, or they would know, as I have already had to point out to Mr. Manly to-day, that the national workshops were placed under the supervision of the Minister of Public Works, and were organized by him. They can never have read Louis Blanc's celebrated pamphlet (published in London), *Observations sur une Récente Brochure de Kossuth, Ledru Rollin, and [sic] Mazzini*, which speaks of "ces ateliers nationaux, œuvre à jamais lamentable du républicain Marie." Nay, even in dealing with German Socialism they can surely never have handled one work of Lassalle's, or they would not persistently spell his name "Lasalle" (it was, indeed, originally "Lassal," but he added the "le" to make it sound French). In short, except Karl Marx and Engels, I can feel no certainty of their having studied at first hand any single Socialist author whom they refer to. On their extraordinary pretermission (beyond a single reference to the Icarians) of all the communistic experiments made in the United States, one of which, that of the Shakers, is this year fulfilling its centenary, while several others have already passed their three quarters of a century, I will not dwell. As to the alleged remark of Carlyle, that "the workman was at least better off under the Terror than he had ever been before," I have hunted for it in vain through his *French Revolution*. Is it a confused and mistaken recollection of a passage at the end of book

iii., ch. i., in which he merely points out how much work must still go on, "let the Government be one of Terror or one of joy?" At any rate I, who have spoken with survivors of that Terror, belonging to the poorer class, know what their recollections were of the miseries of the "Maximum,"—of the days when hours might have to be spent in a *queue* outside a baker's door, before a morsel of bread could be got. They would have laughed in the face of any one who would have told them that the workman was well off under the Terror. But it would take me too long to dwell on your authors' treatment of history. It is enough to say that they speak of Marat, maddened with fever and leprosy, Marat, whose last act in life was to take down the names of Girondist deputies for proscription, and to boast that within eight days they should all go to the scaffold, as "the only man who could have modified the extravagance of the Terror"!

R. Well, I must verify the facts before I can admit the truth of your charges. But you seem to me a good deal less of a Socialist than I thought you. With your views, I wonder at your calling yourself one.

W. I hold by the words of my master, Frederick Maurice: "Any one who recognizes the principle of co-operation as a stronger and truer principle than that of competition has a right to the honour or the disgrace of being called a Socialist."

R. Co-operation! O ay! co-operative stores, co-operative workshops, and all that peddling business. But we Socialists of to-day look for something much larger than that.

W. Did we not look for something larger than that when we agitated (1851) for the reform of the Government contract system, claiming that the payment of "living wages as a minimum to the actual worker, and if thought necessary the non-employment of middlemen," should be made conditions of the contract?¹ Did we not "claim to build up, step by step,

¹ *Christian Socialist*, vol. i., p. 137 (March 1, 1851); and see also pp. 129, 172. A year previously an article in *Fraser's Magazine* (January, 1850), reprinted as No. 4 of the *Tracts by Christian Socialists*, had anticipated the creation of the Pimlico establishment, urging that there was "no reason why there should not be Government clothing workshops as well as Government dockyards."

brick by brick, generation by generation, as class after class is raised in the social scale, and the faculties of each are developed, and the mutual needs of all are better felt, a great and prosperous Socialist State, wherein every member of the population shall be 'well placed, well employed, well educated,' to the utmost extent of any Owenite wishes or speculations" ?¹

R. I really was not aware that you had looked so far ahead. But after all, your movement was only national, our Socialism is international.

W. I do not believe there was ever any movement more thoroughly international in spirit than ours. It grew out of the French Revolution of 1848; we had a French refugee in the Council of Promoters, several of them associates in our workshops; Louis Blanc spoke at our meetings (Germany, you must recollect, was then theorizing only about Socialism, whilst France was at work). But have you any right to call the Socialism of Messrs. Morris and Bax international? I should call it anti-national. Do they not talk of "sapping" the "political nation," so that it shall "give place to the federation of local and industrial organizations"? Have not you spoken yourself of nationality as an "obstructive figment" to be swept away? But do you really think you raise a man in the scale of being when, instead of feeling himself an Englishman first, and then a blacksmith and a Little Pedlingtonian, he feels himself a Little Pedlingtonian and a blacksmith only, though federated in leagues of Little Pedlingtonians and blacksmiths throughout more or less of the world?

R. Mere Chauvinism!

W. Not a bit of it. I am delighted that he should feel more and more the links of fellowship which bind him to French, German, Russian, Chinese blacksmiths; but I am sure that if the link be only that of a common trade interest, it will be brittle as glass. At the same time, I do look upon the growth of fellow feeling amongst the working classes of civilized countries as a fresh earnest of international Socialism, in spite of all the snarlings of the nations one at another.

¹ *Christian Socialist*, vol. i., p. 201 (April 20, 1851).

R. A fresh earnest—where do you see any other?

W. What else are the postal and telegraph services but international Socialism on the largest scale? Do they not bear witness that however the brothers may quarrel, all civilized nations form already but one family throughout the world? Have you ever reflected on the blessedly ludicrous anomaly of Germany and France, armed to the teeth against each other, ready to fly at each other's throats at the smallest provocation, and in the meanwhile transmitting faithfully from each other's frontier the poorest man's letter, telegram, money order, and scrupulously accounting each to the other for the fraction of a half-penny which may represent the share of each in the proceeds? Would the wisest man of antiquity have understood the possibility of such a thing? If amidst all their bickerings and hatreds, civilized nations have already been able to establish, to maintain for years, to extend more and more, a Postal Union which enables me to send a letter or a newspaper to almost any part of the world, a parcel, telegram, money order almost everywhere except to Russia, how far may they not go? And remember that the Postal Union itself forms only one of a group of more or less extensive international agreements relating to the slave-trade, quarantine, the meridian, the calculation of time, the circulation of money,—that even subjects like international arbitration and the fixing of the hours of labour for women and children have been handled, if not mastered. Yes, the family of nations may be a quarrelsome one, some of the big brothers may be big bullies, but the family instinct exists among them, and is growing. And Brotherhood is the great spiritual truth of which Socialism should be the practical realization. From the family let it expand, circle after circle, till it embraces the universe. For us peace, universal peace, is no figment of the intellect; we look forward to it in faith as to the fulfilment of a Divine promise: "In the last days . . . nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

J. M. LUDLOW.

WAGE-EARNERS IN WESTERN QUEENSLAND.

THIS article makes no pretence to deal with the relations of workers and employers in Australia as a whole, but merely to represent as accurately as possible the attitude which is taken up by a large and characteristic section of workers in the West of Queensland towards the economic questions which are clamouring for solution in all civilized countries.

In the first place, it is important to recognize how completely *sui generis* is the class of men which furnishes the workers of Western Queensland. Their attitude towards economic questions is the outcome of the conditions of their life, and is modified by the specific type of character which is every year becoming more stereotyped. The "Bushman," to use the generic term, is at once a cosmopolitan, a nomad, and, to a certain extent, a progressive man. The life of a frontiersman and the peculiar conditions of Australian bush life have produced a type of man unique in the history of the working class. Traits of character which one naturally connects with the pioneers of North America—others which remind one of the "sturdy vagabonds" of by-gone days in Europe—habits brought unchanged from the slums of the Old World—national characteristics, class prejudices,—all these serve to differentiate the individuals who together form a type or class of men characterized, as a class, by a restless anti-national democratic spirit.

This class—all, that is (except managers), who work for wages—may be described roughly as including these elements: (1) the permanent hands on stations; (2) the carrying class; (3) skilled labourers, *e.g.* shearers; (4) unskilled labourers, "rouseabouts," etc.

1. The permanent hands on stations, *e.g.* overseers, blacksmiths, saddlers, boundary riders, etc., earn now twenty to twenty-four shillings a week (reduced July, 1893, from twenty-five or thirty shillings). They are a comparatively small body of men—men worthy of old-country traditions; imbued with the conservative ideas of the earlier colonists; opposed, as a rule, to Unionism, Socialism, etc. The shrewd Scot, the stolid Englishman, the protean Irishman, all are for the time steady upholders of the rights of property. But, for all that, they are not wholly untouched by the restlessness of a life which affords them no real home, and gives no absolute guarantee of permanence in their employment. Though as yet they uphold the powers that be, many of them are curiously inquiring as to the future which the Socialists say must come.

2. Next we have the carriers—those, that is to say, who are employed in conveying wool from the “station” to the railroad, and stores from the terminus to the “station.” The carrier is necessarily a man of some little capital; a waggon, a team or two of horses or bullocks are his stock in trade, necessitating an outlay of from £200 to £500. He lives on the roads while in work, in a bush township when work is slack. He possesses, as a rule, a strong domestic instinct, is generally married, and has a neat little home in the township most convenient for his return after a long trip. A fairly fortunate carrier, with one team, may expect to be working eight or nine months per annum, and to earn £150 clear. He is therefore one of the stable elements in the class of workers. It is true that the carriers, as a body, formed the Carriers’ Union, to defend their interests in the great strike of 1890–91; but the union (this year dissolved) was exclusively concerned with the interests of the carrying trade, and did not, like some of the other unions, touch upon social and political questions.

3. We now come to, perhaps, the most important factor in the working population of Western Queensland, the skilled labourer—that is to say, the shearers. The class of shearers, as far as any question social or political is concerned, is, in Western Queensland, the most active class, and is powerful for good or evil.

The average shearer is young and active, often well educated, oftener still firmly opinionated. He is *par excellence* the progressive man of the West. He earns good wages (often £8 to £9 a week), but this only lasts for five or six months out of the year. He has no settled home, no certainty of a settled income; the vigorous plenty of shearing time alternates with the hungry laziness of the time between the "sheds." A "long vacation" of four or five months is spent in monotonous travelling from spot to spot, as the grass and water may happen to be good—varied in many cases by a senseless orgy at some little bush town. The rowdy shearer spends his whole time in cursing squatters, banks, property-owners of all kinds; the steady shearer, in reading, talking, and thinking of little else than the great problems of social economy, which his leaders hope to solve, some in one way, some in another, and which he feels demand solution, if the colony is ever to be what he believes that it may be, free, prosperous, and progressive.

4. Finally, we have the unskilled labourer—the dam-maker, post-hole sinker, "rouse-about." He lives in much the same way as the shearer, except that his work is less definite, his earnings less, his time of employment far shorter on the average. He is, in fact, the great unemployed, with his cousin the seldom employed. He lives for the most part a purely vagrant life, wandering from water-hole to water-hole; taking a job, if he can get one and feels like work; drinking up his cheque at the nearest town, whenever the said cheque assumes proportions suitable to a "burst." He is the proletarian of the West, the ready aider and abettor of any scheme which promises plunder, plenty, or revenge on his natural enemies, the well-to-do. Of this class are the poor elderly hardworkers, deserving better things; the hopeless vagabond, deserving all he gets; the incurable dipsomaniac, once a skilled mechanic, tailor, doctor, parson, now a "rouse-about." And to these we must add a small steady residuum of honest workers, good men and true, but embittered by evil days and hopeless competition with a crowd of ne'er-do-wells.

Now, observe that there is no real barrier between any

two of these subdivisions of the working class in the West. An overseer may lose his job and swell the ranks of the unemployed. A shearer has always his trade, but he may be so unlucky as to miss every shed for a year; or, on the other hand, his skill with sheep and knowledge of wool may raise him to the position of a wool-sorter or overseer. Any "hand," permanent or casual, may at any time rush off to try his luck at some new "diggings:" he may return a socialistic pauper, or a bloated plutocrat. A saving man of any class with luck may, and often does, start a team of bullocks and become a carrier. A careful "bullocky" (carrier), again, may take up a "selection," and pass from the ranks of the employed to those of the employers. In fact, in the West there is no distinction of class or interest which holds universally, except the ever-shifting line which separates the employers from the employed, the capitalist from the worker. This distinction, in spite of occasional overlapping between the classes of wage-earners and wage-payers, is a real one, and it is the conflict between the interests of employers and those of employees which is bringing to a head in Western Queensland the discontent which is a characteristic of all large classes of men at present working for wages in every civilized community.

The surface indications of this conflict are various, and in some cases of little real importance. The difficulty of adjusting wages, the over-crowding of the labour market, the overwhelming power of combined capital, the disproportion between the rewards of capital and labour,—these are rightly felt by the workers to be just grounds for discontent. The employers, on the other hand, look coldly upon a class of workers whose antagonism to capital is openly avowed. They justly complain of the tyranny of the unions, of the heavy outlay in free rations which the wandering habits of the workers necessitates; they cite cases of bad work for good wages, wanton destruction of "plant," carelessness of all kinds.

On both sides there have always been just causes of complaint, and the consequent strain and irritation first came to an open outbreak of hostility in the strike period of 1891. Then for the

first time the Western worker definitely opposed his strength to that of the employer. The first cause of this rupture, the demand of the shearers, in 1886, for a uniform rate of four shillings the score for sheep shorn, soon yielded to the great question of freedom of contract. All minor points, such as the rate of wages, the right of the men to dictate the conditions of their labour, etc., were felt to hinge on the question whether the capitalist should be allowed to use the full power which his capital gave him in employing any men on any terms which he was able to force the men to accept; in other words, should the capitalist, armed with his capital, be allowed to enter into a contract with the individual handicapped by the competition of every other individual whose needs forced him to work.

As is well known, the strike was, from the workers' point of view, a failure. The Pastoralist Union, backed by a large combination of capital, introduced "blackleg" labour, and the disturbances which ensued necessitated a determined action on the part of Government, which ended in an emphatic assertion of the principle of freedom of contract, and left the worker in much the same position as *ante bellum*. Now, as far as regards questions of wage-rates, conditions of labour, etc., the defeat of the worker is likely to be a final one (except in so far as the organization of labour exercises an indefinite but real restraining power over the employer, and forces him to regard the question of employment as a really serious one). But the workers feel, and rightly, that this defeat is more apparent than real. They realize that the experience of 1891 has altered the character of their action, and is leading them on to the second phase of the labour movement. It is quite possible that the unions will be in no hurry to undertake anything like a second general strike, but, for all that, they exist and are strong, their leaders feel that their action must be no longer confined to class or trade questions, but that they must make up their minds to face the great *social* question by a careful preparation of the ground in the sphere of politics. "Pour passer par la question politique pour arriver à l'amélioration sociale," this, as M. Rollin says, is the course of the Democratic movement, and

this may fairly be said to be the aim and object of the Labour Party in Australia.

As proof and illustration of this assertion we have only to turn to the Programme of the "People's Parliamentary Association of Queensland."

Among the objects of the Association, we find—

- (a) Enrollment of electors.
- (c) Opposition to coloured labour.
- (d) Abolition of State-aided immigration.
- (e) Nationalization of all sources of wealth and all means of producing and exchanging wealth.
- (f) Conducting by State authority of all production and all exchange.
- (g) Pensioning by the State authority of all child, aged, and invalid citizens.
- (h) The saving by the State authority of such a proportion of the joint wealth production as may be requisite for instituting, maintaining, and increasing national capital.
- (i) The maintenance by the State authority, from the joint wealth production, of all educational and sanitary institutions.
- (j) The just division, among all citizens of the State, of all wealth production, less only the part retained for public and common requirements.
- (k) The reorganization of society upon the above lines to be commenced at once, and pursued uninterruptedly until social justice is fully secured to each and every citizen.

These objects are to be attained by pushing vigorously the following Parliamentary Programme, to which the Labour Candidates for Parliament are bound:—

- (a) Universal white adult suffrage for all Parliamentary and local elections; no plural voting, no nominee or property qualification chamber.
- (b) State registration of all citizens as electors.
- (c) Provision for full and complete enfranchisement of the floating population.
- (d) All Parliamentary elections on one day, and that day a close holiday, and all public-houses closed.
- (e) Equal electoral districts on adult population basis.
- (f) Annual Parliaments.
- (g) Abolition of veto.

So far, then, we find the Labour party definitely committed to a socialistic reorganization of the State, which they hope to bring about by a "perfecting of the political machine" on the lines laid down by Mr. Gladstone in his Newcastle speech. First must come the tyranny of the labour organization, sifting, collecting, influencing individuals; next, the tyranny of a numerical majority—the government of the country by whatever class may be numerically strongest. And, finally, the crowning tyranny of a perfected Socialistic State. This is definitely and earnestly striven after by the labourers of Queensland in the sacred name of Liberty. The leaders know what they are doing, though their imaginations may be powerless to present to them the stagnant servitude of their longed-for Utopia. But the workers, as a rule, know nothing further than this, that their battle is against *capital*, and their leaders promise them victory. Socialists, Communists, Anarchists, Radicals, by whatever name they may call themselves, their one desire is to readjust the relations of capital and labour in such a manner that the contract for work to be done should be made between equals; that the pay should be in proportion to the difficulties of the work; that they, as the ultimate producers, should share in the profit which now is divided between banks doing business as usurers, and absentee owners or dividend receivers who have no sense of responsibility towards those whom their agents employ.

Surely, the programme of the Labour party, with its ultimate slavery, is not the be-all and the end-all of a discontent which in many respects may be called divine. Thank God, there are many, and among them owners of large properties, who are striving by the light of Christian ethics to enable every man to claim and receive his due—to arouse in the minds of employers the idea of responsibility, in the minds of employees the idea of duty, so that on neither side shall it be a war of *rights*, but rather a humble return to the conditions of a great *trust*.

Resident landowners, together with many of the selecting class—when they once realize the vigour and earnestness of the Social Democrats—will, we may well hope, sink all minor

differences, and combine to bring into action some such wise and strenuous legislation as that which is making even the ponderous constitution of England slowly assume a really popular and truly socialistic aspect. And in this they will be backed by the carriers, the permanent hands on stations, the less hot-headed even of the shearing class.

To sum up, then. The workers of Western Queensland all and each desire a better day for labour and a more equitable distribution of the power of capital. One party, and that the strongest and best organized, seeks nothing short of a social revolution, and the reconstruction of society on a socialistic basis; the other, and that a small though growing party, desires the steady reform of existing abuses by legal methods (e.g. Truck Acts, Factory Acts, Nationalization of Railways, etc.). Both parties are from time to time helped or hindered, the one by the ignorant proletariat, the other by the equally ignorant and far more selfish body of usurers and capitalists. The Socialists wish for a revolution, the end of which is materialistic and selfish; the social reformers would advocate a reformation, an assertion for the body politic of the verity which the Church has never ceased to proclaim—that we, whether workers or capitalists, are members one of another. “Give me my *rights*,” says one. “Show me my *duty*,” says the other.

GEORGE M. L. LESTER.

THE CHURCH AND HER ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

I PROPOSE in this article to confine myself as far as possible to the actual connection subsisting between the Church and certain elementary schools in the country ; to give reasons why it is well, at all events under present circumstances, to preserve that connection ; and to set forth some expedients by which such maintenance of her schools may be rendered more easy and more secure to the Church in the future. I am well aware that other policies are presented by some, and that in particular the attention of many Churchmen is absorbed just now by the great struggle which is taking place at the London School Board. But because these policies are still only "in the air," because even the famous "circular to teachers," whatever may be its comparative merits, cannot be regarded by any Churchman as an adequate summary of what we desire to teach to the children of Church people, I think it may do good to recall to the minds of Churchmen the actual state of things, and to give them reasons why we should still concentrate our main effort upon the preservation and extension of our own schools. It seems to me that this is the more necessary, because there is not a little danger that the excitement of a pitched battle with the Undenominationalists may divert a part of that strenuous endeavour which is still necessary, if the Church is to preserve intact the position she has hitherto held in the elementary education of England.

I.

The first thing we Churchmen have to do is to set in clear relief, before our own minds and those of our opponents, the true ground on which we struggle now as ever to keep up our

voluntary or denominational schools. It is important to do this, because very frequently and sometimes very unscrupulously our opponents misrepresent the reasons which induce us to act as we do. It is said, for instance, that the Church is jealous of State-aided and State-controlled schools; or that we desire to minister to the self-importance of the parochial clergy; or that we are anxious to bring up the children of the poor in due subordination to their social superiors. A very brief examination of our position, as it was taken in 1870 and has been maintained since, will suffice to dispose of these calumnies.

It is almost forgotten by the present generation that, down to the year 1870, the State, in making its grants in aid of elementary schools, was careful to uphold the principle that the education given in those schools should rest upon a definitely religious basis. This important end was secured by the fact that, for a long period, the grants in aid were invariably made through the medium of one or other of three societies, the direct object of all of which was to provide religious instruction for the children to whose wants they ministered. Thus the National Society took over the charge of Anglican schools, the British and Foreign School Society that of Nonconformist schools, and the Roman Catholic Poor Schools Committee that of the schools of their own communion. That these societies, zealous as they were, failed to cover the whole ground, or that there was a grievous lack of schools in many parts of the country, when Mr. Forster undertook his great work, I should be the last to deny; but the charge of Churchmen against the Act of 1870 is not that it founded new schools, or even that it founded Board schools, but that it revolutionized the conditions under which religious instruction was in future to be given to the children. Hitherto the State had co-operated with the various Christian bodies; it had recognized by means of its grants the good secular education which they all gave; and it had left each body free to combine the teaching of its own religious tenets with the giving of that secular instruction. It had even gone further: it had directed its own official inspectors to examine the children in religious as well as in secular

knowledge. But in 1870 all this was changed. The State continued indeed to make grants from the Treasury to all schools alike, whatever their religious complexion might be ; and for this measure of concession Churchmen may be grateful. But the power of levying a compulsory rate, sure in the long run to be an enormous lever of advantage, was strictly confined to those schools in which either no religion was taught at all, or a religious instruction was given which excluded the use of any distinctive formulary, and therefore of the formularies of the Church of England.

It is not my object to enlarge here upon the injustice of this proceeding. It amounted to nothing less, and the years that have passed have shown that it amounted to nothing less, than the endowment by the State of one particular form of religious teaching, and that, too, at the cost, in many cases, of men who would have preferred to support some one of the others ; it has been ever since the fruitful parent of unending strife, and it is directly responsible for the slow and uneven advance of primary education in England. But the only consequence on which I now desire to insist is this : it left the Church of England without any alternative as to the maintenance of her own distinctive schools. Had there been created, as in America, a universal system of secular State schools, she would at least have felt that all Denominations were being treated alike ; had there been, as there ought to have been, an allocation of the rates on a denominational instead of an undenominational basis, she would of course have had no objection to make. But, as it was, she had to choose between allowing her children to be taught Christianity in a way that was emphatically not her way, but that of her opponents, and struggling, at whatever cost to her members, to keep up and, as far as possible, extend her existing schools. Loyal to the Master Whose she is, she did not hesitate for a moment to begin and thenceforward to carry on the still enduring struggle.

There is a simple answer to the question, then, Why do we Churchmen keep up our Voluntary schools ? Because, as things are, there is no other way in which we can daily give to the

children of poor Church people the religious instruction in which as Churchmen we believe. Other reasons there may be of a contributory kind ; this is primary and decisive.

II.

There are not a few thoughtful and zealous Churchmen who, having realized that the actual position is as I have stated it, are inclined to cut the knot in very trenchant fashion. "Why," say they, "should we go on with a struggle which costs infinite and thankless pains, and the mere fact of which exposes us to the oft-repeated charge that we Churchmen are opposed to the rightful education of the people ? Surely it would be better to take our stand upon a definite and intelligible principle ; to say, once for all, that the State shall charge itself with the secular education, and the secular education only, and that we of the Church, or of the other religious bodies, will make it our business to give the children religious instruction at times when they are not engaged in secular learning. By adopting this expedient," say the Churchmen I am thinking of, "we should free ourselves from a heavy charge upon our pockets and our energies, and should be able to concentrate our efforts, as we ought, upon spiritual things."

I have put this view as clearly as I can, because the consideration of it will afford me an opportunity both of dwelling upon some of the subsidiary reasons for keeping up our voluntary schools, and of indicating the methods by which we may best justify their existence at the bar of public opinion.

The proposal to separate the spheres of religious and secular instruction entirely is plausible and tempting ; nevertheless there are at least two reasons why, in my humble opinion, we ought decidedly to reject it.

1. It is not a practical proposal ; no one of the more prominent religious parties into which this country is divided would accept it ; and we have none of us time to follow out suggestions which are not within reach of our own, or, so far as we can see, of future generations. If I am asked why I speak with so

much assurance, I answer that, of all the educational phenomena of the last twenty-five years, perhaps the most striking has been the progressive discredit into which the idea of a purely secular State education has almost everywhere fallen. Actual experience has, in fact, proved the truth of what the more cautious thinkers have always predicted. Under a purely secular system of State education a large number of children, in spite of the strenuous efforts of all the religious bodies, fail to receive any religious instruction at all; and both States and municipalities have found that these children grow up a menace to society. The common sense of the world has pretty well decided that, if religious instruction is to be brought home to anything like the whole of the rising generation, then Church and State must work together to that end. And, as I have had occasion to say before, it is not as if the arrangement could be easily adopted, even if Churchmen should at last be brought to consent to it as the least in a choice of evils. The Nonconformists, who are more than satisfied with the religious instruction at present given in Board schools, would fight to the bitter end against a purely secular system of State education.

2. To consent to this absolute separation between the spheres of religious and secular instruction would be to give up principles of education which many of us hold very strongly, and which the present system, whatever may be its drawbacks, does enable us to maintain. One of the chief of those principles concerns the question of entrusting the religious and secular instruction to different teachers. I doubt if there be a single elementary school teacher, either in Board schools or Voluntary schools, whose experience does not lead him to say that, if the children are to profit to the full by the religious instruction given to them, that religious instruction must be given by the same teachers who are commissioned to give the secular teaching. That the two kinds of instruction should be united in the same hands, has for long been a principle in the constitution of Christian schools, and one that Churchmen have hitherto upheld as almost essential to their being; and it seems to me we ought

to be very sure of the ground we are about to take before we consent to its abandonment. The Bishop of Manchester, whose authority will not be questioned, has assured us that, in the colony of Victoria, the efforts of the various religious bodies to introduce religious instruction into the schools, by means of special teachers sent in from outside, completely broke down. There can be little doubt that, at least for the first few generations of children, there would be great danger in England also, not perhaps of hopeless break-down, but at all events of grave inadequacy, on the part of such a system. In one direction, and one only, does it seem worth while to try the experiment. We might perhaps extricate ourselves from our difficulties in regard to the religious instruction of Church children in Board schools, if it could be legally arranged that, at certain times in the day, teachers commissioned by the Church might go into the schools and freely give religious instruction to the children of their own faith. The plan is actually adopted, I believe, in Ireland; we could lose nothing by trying it in Board schools here, and we might gain a great deal. In that case we should, of course, be prepared to give to Nonconformist children in Church schools the same privileges which we claimed for Church children in Board or other "Undenominational" schools. But to make the plan universal in any other sense than this—to give up our existing Church schools in the hope that we should be able to give our children religious instruction by means of machinery of which there is as yet scarce the vestige of a sign,—this, considering the position we still hold, would be nothing less than folly.

I pass over the many arguments which exist, at least in the eyes of Churchmen, for retaining the present close connection between the Church and the Church's elementary schools—the important part they play in parochial machinery, the value of a direct educational contact between the parish priest and the little ones of his flock, the guarantee they afford to Churchmen for the faith of the rising generation. It will be replied, no doubt, that the question just now is not so much of what is

desirable as of what is possible ; and I will endeavour to deal with that point in my third section. In the mean time I will advert to two or three matters which are of the highest importance, if we are to gain public sympathy for our position.

1. I have said that the primary and decisive reason for the maintenance of our Church schools is that, as things actually are, they afford the only means by which we can give the Church's religious instruction to Church children as a part of their daily education. It is, however, alleged in more than one quarter that there are Church schools into which the clergy of the parish never, or hardly ever, enter, and Church schools, again, in which the religious instruction given is of an exceedingly perfunctory kind. Now, it is not to be supposed that the spirit of our own strongly undenominational age is to be successfully encountered by denominationalism of this kind. The public will go on ignoring even the just educational claims of Churchmen, if they can plead the smallest excuse for believing that Churchmen in general, and the clergy in particular, are only half in earnest about their schools. I was told, only the other day, by an active clergyman in the very heart of London, that the working classes are by no means so indifferent as is sometimes assumed to the character of the religious instruction given in the elementary schools ; that many of them preferred the religious instruction in Church schools to that in Board schools ; that the attendance in his own school was good and increasing, and this although the population of the neighbourhood was diminishing. I do not say that such an experience is common ; but that it should occur at all was a startling reminder that the ultimate victory may lie in our own hands much more often than we suppose. The English are a fair-minded race, and if they clearly see that the maintenance of Church schools is a matter of conscience with Churchmen, they will do them justice at last.

2. Second only to the necessity that Churchmen should make the religious instruction in their schools sincere and real, is the necessity that they should also manifest a sincere and real interest in the secular education. We must not allow it to be

possible even for our enemies to say that, provided we can get an opportunity of making our children Churchmen, we are comparatively indifferent to the degree or quality of the secular education we give them. We must repudiate once for all the suicidal doctrine that Churchmen who are members of school-boards ought to vote against reasonable improvements in primary education, and in Board schools, because these things make the struggle still more hard than it is already for the Voluntary schools. We must show ourselves, as Churchmen have done in past ages, and as English Churchmen notably showed themselves in the middle of the present century, believers in education because we are believers in Christianity. We must, in a word, make it evident that we are as anxious as those who oppose us that a good secular education should be given to the children; that our difference from our opponents is not connected with the secular education at all, but concerns the religious instruction which we desire to give along with it. I speak strongly, because a considerable experience leads me to think that the classes who use the elementary schools are very doubtful about our Church schools upon this point; and it ought to be a first object with us to reassure them.

3. Before leaving this over-long section, I would say a word or two upon the necessity of conducting the struggle on behalf of Voluntary schools in our corporate capacity as a Church. Hitherto, what we have mainly done is to fight a succession, or perhaps I should rather say a co-existence, of pitched battles all over the field. Each school has fought for its own life, and not a few schools have expired in so doing, because they have had no ruri-decanal or diocesan organization at their back. A great deal has been done of late years to improve matters in this respect; and perhaps I need say no more of the imperative need of making the maintenance of our schools a corporate work of the whole Church. But it is not enough simply to take this defensive measure of "association." The Church should also look outside herself and her own schools, and, as it were, keep an eye upon the general educational situation. What is it precisely, for instance, that the State wants in connection with

elementary education? and what is it that the Church wants? Much harm has been done by those over-zealous Churchmen who have confounded in a common condemnation the religious and the secular instruction given in Board schools, and thus made the average man think that they were opposed, not only to undenominational religious teaching, but also to good secular education. The objection to all this is, that it is not scientific fighting; it is as if a commander of cavalry were to insist upon making a charge, even though he left the flank of the main army uncovered, or as if a general should be always giving battle, whether his troops happened at the moment to be in a good position or not. If we choose our positions carefully, and make it clear at what points we intend to fight and at what we do not, there is always the possibility, not only of defending ourselves successfully, but also of ultimately coming to terms of agreement. It would be a consummation devoutly to be wished, indeed, that the religious difficulty in the matter of elementary education should be finally and satisfactorily settled. For that reason I think that Churchmen should not be content simply to maintain the *status quo*, but should consider whether some better state of things than the present cannot be brought about; and therefore I venture to append the following considerations upon the vexed question of rate-aid.

III.

Why has a demand for rate-aid arisen at all?

Immediately, no doubt, from the very serious financial difficulties which now beset us in carrying on our schools. And I should like to say, with all deference, that these difficulties are not always appreciated at their proper strength by those Churchmen who have only had to do with Church schools in small towns or country villages. In such places the Church has held her own pretty well. Her schools may not always be fitted out with the latest improvements; yet a rather more strenuous effort to obtain subscriptions will generally provide the funds, and the "crisis" passes away till its successor

appears. But we shall very gravely misconceive the educational situation, if we regard it only from the point of view of our comparative success in the country districts. It is in the great towns, especially of the north, that the decisive actions have been fought; and in the great towns we have been smitten indeed. It is in them that we have felt the full injustice of which the Act of 1870 has been capable; it is in the great towns that Churchmen have had at once to pay their school-board rate, and to subscribe to the maintenance of their own schools. It is largely with the money exacted from Churchmen that the religious instruction of the Board schools has been propagated; and, again, it is largely because they have been saddled with this double burden, that Churchmen have been so often compelled to allow the secular education given in their schools to suffer. When we remember that it is the country districts that must follow in the wake of the towns, and not the towns which will follow in the wake of the country districts, we shall see that the triumph of the school-board system in the great towns is, so far as the Church's schools are concerned, the most ominous feature that confronts us.

It is not wonderful, then, that from the towns of the north, where, more than anywhere else, men understand that it is perfectly useless for the Church to keep open her schools, unless she can give in them a secular education which will compare with that given in the Board schools, there should have arisen a strong demand for rate-aid. Let us, as we consider the matter, remind ourselves that there is nothing revolutionary or unfair in the suggestion that Church schools should receive aid from the rates. They already receive aid from the taxes; and the objection that denominational institutions ought not to receive a share of public money—which is itself a purely gratuitous assumption of the Undenominationalists—cannot in this case consistently be raised. The difficulty that with the payment of rates there goes a right of control on the part of the rate-payer, is one that I will notice in a moment; before doing so, I will point out another consideration which makes it not unnatural that we should endeavour to obtain

rate-aid for our own schools. It is not as if we were urging for the first time that elementary schools should be supported by a levy from the rates; that principle was established and acted upon in 1870. Most of us Churchmen do, as a matter of fact, pay the educational rate already; all that we want is that the rate thus paid by us shall be so allocated as to help to support the schools in which is taught the religion which we profess. We do not ask that schools should be supported out of the public moneys in any other way than they are now; we only ask that the rate, like the parliamentary grant, shall be made available to the schools of all religious bodies, instead of being confined as now to schools of one religious complexion. We desire that Churchmen should have something for their money.

It is easy to formulate this demand; it is not so easy to draw up a plan by which it may practically be carried out. But a great deal will be gained, to my thinking, if Churchmen will only study the problem with a sincere desire to solve it, and clearly put before their minds the conditions which must be satisfied if it is to be solved at all. I cannot pretend to review here the innumerable schemes for rate-aid which have lately been put forward; but I will, before I close, set down what appear to be the main conditions which any scheme must satisfy, and indicate the lines along which a successful scheme is likely to move.

The conditions which any scheme of rate-aid must satisfy, to be acceptable to us at all, are two in number.

1. The control of the religious instruction in denominational schools must be left in the hands of the denomination to which the school belongs.

2. The teachers of such denominational schools, inasmuch as they will give both the secular and the religious instruction, must be appointed by the denominational managers, or at least must not be appointed without the approval of the denominational managers.

With regard to the first point, it would of course be nothing less than suicidal to accept aid from the rates at the cost of sacrificing the independence and integrity of the Church teaching

at present given in our schools. We only want rate-aid in order to keep up the schools; and we only or mainly keep up the schools in order that we may give the religious instruction of the Church to Church children. One obvious way in which this condition might be secured would be to apply the whole of the rate-aid in all elementary schools to the secular instruction, and leave the religious instruction in denominational schools to be paid for by the denomination to which the school belonged. What they did not pay for, the rate-payers could not claim to control.

With regard to the second point, the maintenance of the religious and secular teaching in the same hands is essential, if we are to have "Church schools," and not merely schools in which Church teaching may be given. It follows, therefore, that the teachers of secular knowledge in denominational schools must be persons of the same denomination as the managers and children of such schools, and be known by the managers to be willing and competent to give the denominational religious instruction required. In other words, the managers must have an effective voice in their appointment. This condition, like the last, is a *sine qua non* of the acceptance of rate-aid.

The schemes of rate-aid which do not secure these two points may be put upon one side; those which do, fall broadly into two classes. There are schemes which are simply of a tentative and permissive character; schemes which endeavour to make it possible for such distressed Voluntary schools as wish it to obtain rate-aid from the local school-board, or, failing a school-board, from the county council. There are others, again, which aim at a resettlement of the entire elementary education question throughout the country; schemes which may be said to aim at establishing rate-aid for all elementary schools alike, only on a denominational, not an undenominational basis. I will not attempt to decide here between these two classes of schemes, but will content myself with two last words to objectors. It is usual to say that in practice all these rate-aid schemes would present so many excuses for difference of opinion as to be unworkable. My answer is that, in all

essentials, what I advocate is done already for the Jewish schools under the London School Board. Only let school-boards throughout England treat Anglican schools as the London School Board treats Jewish schools, and I should have little more to say. Again, it is said that, supposing by some miracle one of these rate-aid schemes were started, a new generation of rate-payers, or a new majority in the House of Commons, would very soon find some excuse for interfering with and practically controlling the religious instruction given in denominational schools. "Better stand," it is said, "by the existing compromise." To which argument I can only answer that the existing compromise itself, the sacred pact of 1870, entirely depends for its continuance upon the will of the rate-payers and the House of Commons. There are very many persons in England who think it concedes too much to the Church, and would upset it to-morrow if they could. It is maintained intact only because we Churchmen are strong enough to hold our adversaries in check. I believe that we are strong enough to carry an equitable scheme of rate-aid, if we choose; and, still more, that, if we once get it, we are strong enough to keep it effective.

Even as I write, a statesman of the position of Mr. Balfour is hinting at the possibility of a change in the relation of the State to its elementary schools. The first duty of Churchmen is to hold the schools they have, and to make fairer terms for them as soon as opportunity offers; the duty next to that is, to provide machinery for the better religious instruction of the many Church children who now attend board-schools.

GEORGE W. GENT.

CO-OPERATIVE CREDIT.

THE idea of Co-operative Credit, of which the *Economic Review* has allowed me to make myself the spokesman in its pages, has met in this country with a far readier and more sympathetic reception than there seemed any reason to look for. It is quite true that we have not yet a single co-operative bank established to put the principle advocated into practice. But unquestionably not a little interest has been excited, and, though the number of those is probably small who fully understand the methods and the principle of the agency recommended, there are not a few who perceive that a sore spot in our system has been touched, a real want has been laid bare, and that the remedy suggested is likely to prove effective, alike to cure the one and to supply the other. The evidences of interest betokened are numerous. I have been called upon to explain the system in the Committee Room of the House of Commons, before the Central Chamber of Agriculture and at any rate one other Chamber, before the Royal Commission now sitting at Westminster, and before various other bodies. I have been specially summoned to Dublin to render the same exegetic service before a most sympathetic as well as representative audience, the Irish Agricultural Organization Society, and to repeat my explanation privately in the palace of the Roman Catholic Archbishop. While interest has been aroused in what was to me an unexpected degree, it has at the same time been found that the difficulties which doubtless hinder progress a little are in reality less formidable than was at first apprehended. Our adverse law—very injudiciously and improperly restrictive, as a Parliamentary Counsel has admitted—no doubt constitutes an awkward stumbling-block. But, on the other hand, our country-folk do not shrink back, as it was thought that they would,

from the "joint liability," which they perceive that with a little caution and vigilance they can keep within perfectly safe limits. Bankers do not eye the proposed institution with suspicion or jealousy. One leading banker has admitted to me that he "believes that People's Banks may be found useful." Another owns that, in his opinion, they meet a crying want which, to their shame, the joint-stock banks have thus far failed to supply. A director and a manager of a leading Irish bank have both frankly stated that they see no reason why their bank should not lend money to co-operative banks; those banks will, they declare, echoing my own words, constitute far more desirable borrowers than the individuals who compose them; and thus they will open to the existing banks new channels for business.

Thus far we have received the warmest welcome at the hands of agriculturists. In agricultural quarters the message of coming credit has been hailed as a herald of relief. The Agricultural Banks Association, formed to diffuse information and further the creation of banks, has been freely plied with applications for information, more particularly in respect of the service to be rendered to the smaller cultivators. I myself have been summoned into various agricultural counties to explain, and I have a fresh list of such engagements now before me. Some few large land-owners are showing themselves anxious, and even impatient, to form banks on their own properties; and very possibly even before these lines appear in print we shall have established our first little lending institution in a northern county. There is really nothing remarkable in the particular eagerness shown by Agriculture. It is true that all our little pioneer experiments in quasi-co-operative credit have thus far been carried on in towns, among an industrial and trading population. Our Slate clubs, our Money clubs, our Loan societies, our Self-help societies, and those two excellently managed co-operative Loan associations which minister in a growing current to the pecuniary wants of civil servants, all making for our principle, all testifying in an elementary way to its goodness, one and all have their working spheres in towns. They ought, one might have thought, to

have prepared the ground and paved the way in those centres for co-operative credit. But, generally speaking, Agriculture stands in more urgent need, and is at present more helpless. The Inquiry by the Royal Commission has made it clear that one very effective alleviative of depression is the possession of sufficient working capital. Again, we are looking for an early multiplication of allotments under the Parish Councils Act. And for allotment-holders the credit which may be dispensed by co-operative banks promises to prove a very godsend. Therefore, if allotments really multiply, we may expect that soon we shall have a goodly array of agricultural banks to show. Moreover, on no ground has co-operative credit banking in its past experience abroad produced more certain and more uniformly useful results than in its application to agriculture—in France even under conditions which might be held to make the experiment just a little risky. Unquestionably, country folk make at the outset the most trustworthy borrowers. It is wholly incorrect, however, to pretend that the peculiar organization of our social and industrial system, the predominance of large productive establishments as opposed to small handicraft, makes co-operative credit inapplicable in our more densely populated localities. I would ask those who hold this opinion to see, if possible, for themselves how co-operative credit is prospering in Verviers, a town in which the working population is so much gathered together in large establishments, that, but for the speech and dress of the inhabitants, among its mills and factories one might easily fancy one's self in Lancashire. Nevertheless, not only does co-operative credit thrive in that town, but it thrives so well as to have raised the local co-operative bank to premier rank in the kingdom, over the heads of the banks of more populous cities—even of that of Liège, which enjoys the prestige of being officered by the leading co-operators of Belgium. Out of its 50,000 inhabitants, Verviers has supplied more than 2,600 members to the co-operative bank. That surely is proof sufficiently plain that the utility of co-operative credit is not limited to places with small trade and handicraft only.

Interest in the movement which has been set going is likely to be not a little quickened by a new departure in co-operation generally, which has not met with the attention which it deserves. Co-operation is re-organizing itself. The divisions which have so long separated the various forms, and the various local organizations, of co-operation, are being wiped out. There is a general disposition to join hands and close ranks, to ally production with supply and both with credit. France has shown us the way in the alliance formally established between its various branches of co-operative organizations, and the work of all-round union promises to be completed by the first International Co-operative Congress which is to meet in London, some weeks hence, to inaugurate an International Co-operative Alliance, designed to insure to co-operators in all countries mutual support and mutual interchange of ideas and information. There has long been a talk of the desirableness of such a union. And the proposition has been so cordially responded to in all quarters, that we may expect a gathering of no little authority and influence, taking important business in hand.

The union to be concluded is not to be a mere show union. It is recognized that there is practical work to be done. The matter affects co-operative credit more specifically, because the new developments aimed at, which are further to raise the position of workers and to secure to them greater economic independence, are found to be very largely dependent upon the command of money, which, under the circumstances, only credit is in a position to supply.

In respect of co-operative supply we have, in the interchange of information and experience which the alliance is to bring about, probably very little to learn—except it be the lesson, which certainly promises to be useful, that co-operation between nations may be as serviceable as co-operation between individuals. Our co-operators buy considerable quantities of goods from abroad. Why not take them straight from their brother co-operators, the producers? I ventured to broach the subject at a co-operative luncheon held at Paris in January last, in

celebration of the alliance just concluded between French Co-operative Supply Associations and Agricultural Syndicates. A visit paid to London in consequence of this by representatives of some French viticultural syndicates, has satisfied those gentlemen that they can supply us by direct means with much better wine, genuine and pure, at 15 or 20 per cent. less than the current price, while, on the other hand, there are many things which they could buy advantageously over here. There are other articles in respect of which the syndicates could serve us as cheaply.

When we come to production and credit, on the other hand, we find that we have a great deal indeed to learn from our neighbours, and that they no less have a great deal to learn from one another. In truth, half the co-operators of Europe are not aware what the other half are doing, and unless they are brought together to rub shoulders and compare notes, they never will be. The cause of production, more in particular, which from the workers' point of view is by far the most important form of co-operation, promises to be not a little furthered by this interchange. At the present time, with the innumerable difficulties standing in its way, production is the standing crux of co-operators. Like some of our neighbours we have attempted to solve the attractive problem, not without some partial success. We have now something like seventy productive co-operative establishments. But probably in every one of them, as in the famous Familistère, the Paper Works of Angoulême, and other establishments of which a parade is frequently made, there is some good fairy standing at the back of the concern, supplying the capital, or else taking all the risk, or guiding the concern with superior knowledge. Abroad, by the side of these only semi-co-operative institutions, there are at any rate some *bonâ fide* co-operative associations to be found which should to us be full of instruction. In the last number of the *Review* I told the story of one such establishment, the cabinet-makers' *Magazzini Generali* at Milan. In France there are some similar institutions which, one might say, really carry their work one grade lower, inasmuch as they are composed, not of men selling

their wares in their own shop and therefore working for their own account or in a factory, but of men who take jobs and contracts elsewhere — painters, plumbers, plasterers, stone-cutters, stone-breakers, etc. When, a few weeks ago, I attended the *Chambre Consultative* of these associations, there were a round seventy of them. As a specimen of what they do, let me state the case of one of the most prosperous of these bodies, *Le Travail*, an association of painters—twenty-two in number, but often employing additional hands in busy times—who do in the course of a year something like £20,000 or £22,000 worth of work. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The association would not be given that work if they did not execute it to the satisfaction of their customers. Nevertheless, thanks to the stimulus imparted to head and hand by the sense of independence and the knowledge that whatever is done will benefit the workers themselves, not only can the association allow its members one franc a day higher wages than nearly all other employers, but it pays besides, at the close of the year, an additional penny per hour out of realized profits (which are shared in the same proportion by the non-members employed); it pays about 50 per cent. annually on the small shares in the concern held by members; and it carries a sufficient contribution every year to the General Pension Fund to secure to every member after twenty-five years' work a substantial pension, benefiting, in case of his death, his widow or his orphans on a somewhat reduced scale. And over and beyond this, the association can allow its members 6 per cent. interest on all the savings they choose to deposit!

These associations are steadily on the increase. So far as they go, they appear perfectly to solve the problem of the emancipation and the highest development of the productiveness of labour to the injury of no one—without friction, without fighting, without jealousy. It cannot be said that such methods are altogether impossible in England. Give the British workman something to work for, something that will benefit himself, and he is likely to work even better than the French, leaving limitation of hours, a "living wage," and all the other things

which are to be provided by State interference to take care of themselves. None of these enterprises, however, show themselves practicable without the independent command of money, which a common co-operative bank can best provide, because it lays the borrower under the smallest obligation, as of a favour received. Co-operative credit is thus directly indicated, not merely as a useful help to the cottager in a period of agricultural depression, but as the necessary ground-work for most important co-operative progress, leading to the settlement of the troublesome relations between capital and labour by peaceful means.

The importance of this is now, to all appearance, being realized in France, a country which ought under this aspect to be of especial interest to us, inasmuch as it has begun to tread the path of progress towards the realization of co-operative credit only a very little before ourselves, after a long refusal based on the same grounds which are so continually being brought forward here. Not very long ago co-operative credit was in France the same tabooed innovation which at the present day it is to many among ourselves. A few years ago it was still declared "irréalisable." There was said to be no need of it; or else it was opposed to the habits of the country. Now it is the object desired in all quarters, and a great Commission of sixty members has lately been sitting at Paris, by order of Parliament, to consider means of extending it. The striking success which my friend M. Durand has achieved in the creation of Raiffeisen banks—he has formed sixty in a few months—and the happy experience of credit institutions organized on a much less perfect principle by the Agricultural Syndicates, have probably led to this striking change in public temper. It is interesting to note, in two readable publications which have quite recently issued from the press—one of them a little late in the day¹—the struggles of the infant institutions, one or two of

¹ *Cinquième Congrès des Banques Populaires Françaises, Actes du Congrès.* [Menton, 1894.]

Les Conférences du Sud-Ouest. Première Année, No. 3 and 4. [Bordeaux, Delmas, 1894.]

them certainly not perfect, by which co-operators are endeavouring to supply what is wanting—to their credit be it said, for a remarkable exception in France, without State aid. The strong tenacity with which the French, while professing themselves the most democratic people in the universe, cling to the belief that nothing can be accomplished in a country without assistance given from above, paid for by others—that subsidies and not self-help are to provide the bricks with which an economic structure is to be raised up—unquestionably forms something of a danger to growing co-operative credit. So do denominational prejudices, which are becoming very observable in some quarters; and so does, of course, that powerful wave of Socialism which is ever and anon sweeping over the country, drenching those whom it does not carry away with some of its principles. It is probably of the influence of Socialism that M. Leroy Beaulieu is thinking when, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, he declares, taking me personally a little to task, that the advocates of co-operative credit really aim at turning the world topsy-turvy by making “labour” the master and “capital” the servant. In truth, the advocates of co-operative credit, it is almost needless to point out, aim at nothing of the kind. They do not wish to deprive the capitalist of one farthing’s worth of his legitimate advantages. Their object is to level upwards, not downwards. All that they set themselves to do is, to make capital—not the power but the commodity, an article always saleable in the market at its own price, that is, at the price of the security offered in exchange—accessible to possessors of such security on equal terms. Those terms now vary from 0 per cent. to almost anything per cent.—rightly in many cases, and in many cases, if not rightly, at any rate excusably, because there is no standard by which to gauge a certain class of security, which nevertheless is in point of fact very good security, no agency by which to make it “bankable.” Thanks to the presence of co-operative banks the Lombardy peasant now buys the capital at 6 per cent. per annum, for which, a few years ago, without such an agent to procure it for him, he was compelled to pay 400, 600, 1200 per cent.—if, indeed,

he was not denied it altogether. That is what we want to bring about elsewhere. We do not dispute the judgment of the market. We do not ask that security which warrants a high interest only shall be forced upon the lender at a low interest. We simply seek, on the principle of the old simile of the "faggot," to make that security which the poor man possesses, and which is in itself often thoroughly good, or else can be made so, available and negotiable in the market. It may even be said that by co-operation we *create* a security where formerly there was none. In doing so, so far from wronging "capital," we render it a distinct service, in increasing the demand for its specific ware by providing a larger constituency to bid for it. There is no wrong in this, no encroachment, no taking anything from any one. Like the co-operative production spoken of above, but in a far higher degree, the creation of new bankable securities adds directly to national wealth and national production, by making labour more effective and more productive. The experience of foreign countries has shown that such increase, on a large scale, is perfectly practicable, bringing in its train, in the shape of the emancipation, of the educating, the elevating of those who toil, blessings which not a few of us are likely to rate even above those economic effects first apparent to the eye. Please God, under the influence of the growing propagandist movement, which has not begun badly, we shall soon see the same benefits extended to ourselves.

HENRY W. WOLFF.

TOWN LIFE IN THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.¹

ECONOMISTS and historical students generally have eagerly awaited the publication of Mrs. J. R. Green's *Town Life in the Fifteenth Century*. They have been anxious to learn what new and valuable evidence would be brought to light, what new theories propounded and supported by the widow and literary executor of so famous an historian as the late Mr. J. R. Green. Now that the work is actually to be obtained, the writer of this paper finds some little difficulty in expressing the mingled feelings of appreciation and disappointment with which she has concluded a careful perusal of its pages. The author is manifestly well acquainted with the greater portion of her subject, and the book is written in a brilliant and forcible style; but many of us will lament the tone of depreciation and impatience in which Mrs. Green refers to the labours of other English scholars in the same field of research, and which, in the case of a less well-known writer, might argue a certain incapacity to apprehend the difficulties of the subject. The work, moreover, suffers considerably from the non-concentration of ideas, from the lack of a strong centre-piece, round which the author's somewhat disconnected and occasionally varying statements might with advantage have been grouped. Yet, notwithstanding the loose order of its arrangement, the work is deeply fascinating, and the reader does carry away a distinct impression, not only of the author's enthusiasm for her subject, but of her strong and fervent belief in the uninterrupted prosperity of the mediæval borough.

Mrs. Green presents a glowing picture of the machinery and privileges of a mediæval town. She describes with ardour how the burghers set to work to provide a constitution for purposes of local self-government; how they organized and reviewed the armed bands of citizens for purposes of defence; how they jealously guarded the "liberties" within which the borough-law ran, protected the common property of the burghers, provided for the execution of public works, supported the town "waits," or minstrels, "who go

¹ *Town Life in the Fifteenth Century*. By Mrs. J. R. Green. [Vol. i., xvi., 439 pp.; vol. ii., 476 pp. 8vo. 15s. each. Macmillan. London, 1894.]

every morning about the town, piping" (vol. i. p. 145); and saw to the annual performance of the town play, or mystery, with its accompanying pageants.

Of the burghers themselves and their especial privileges Mrs. Green treats in her fifth chapter. She is careful to emphasize the exclusive nature of the franchise, and enumerates in some detail the various unenfranchised classes of town-dwellers. Among these first came the inhabitants who paid for especial trading rights, or who were admitted as members of the Gild Merchant. A more difficult class to deal with were the dependants of the neighbouring lay or ecclesiastical dignitaries; next came the country traders who lived outside the town; and, finally, the "non-burgesses" so called, who had no share whatever in the government of the town, nor any right to stallage in its fair or market.

Mrs. Green then goes on triumphantly to record the indefatigable patience and courage with which the burghers set themselves to solve the problem of local government. She details the conflicting claims and authorities which had to be either acknowledged or compounded for. First came the sheriff's authority as king's officer, and next in importance was that of the bailiff or steward of the neighbouring abbot or lord of the manor. If, upon occasion, it entered the royal head to pay a visit to the borough, the steward and marshals of the king's house had jurisdiction for twelve miles, to be counted from the lodging of the king; and their authority superseded all other law, whether of the borough or the shire. Similarly, the sheriff's accustomed rule was superseded by the authority of the judges from Westminster, when they came down to administer the king's justice.

But Mrs. Green is at pains to show how little the spirit of the burghers was daunted by the difficulties they met with. They cared as little for the supremacy of the ecclesiastical power as for that of the feudal baronage, and mercilessly routed both. Mrs. Green very rightly ascribes much of the bitter fanaticism which came to be roused against the Church in the fifteenth century to the feuds and jealousies which arose in the conflicts between the towns and their ecclesiastical lords.

Both in her description of the mediæval town and of the commercial and industrial revolution which characterized the fifteenth century, Mrs. Green is never weary of insisting on the "*uninterrupted prosperity*" which attended the towns in their struggle for wealth and independence. "From the twelfth century," says Mrs. Green, "all went well with the municipalities for three hundred years. . . . The forward movement never ceased; . . . every victory counted for liberty,

and every success justified faith and inspired new zeal. The burghers went on filling their purses on the one hand, and drawing up constitutions for their towns on the other, till, in the fifteenth century, they were in fact the guardians of English wealth and the arbiters of English politics" (i. 12).

Elsewhere we read : "What with the inland and the outland trade, riches gathered into the hands of the merchants with bewildering rapidity ; . . . the whole country, in fact, shared in traders' profits from king to peasant" (i. 57, 58).

Or this : "In the course of the next hundred years we see trading ports such as Lynn, Sandwich, Southampton, or Bristol ; and centres of inland traffic such as Nottingham, Leicester, or Reading ; and manufacturing towns like Norwich, Worcester, or York, heaping up wealth, doubling and trebling their yearly expenditure, raising the salaries of their officers, building new quarters, adorning their public offices and churches, lavishing money on the buying of new privileges for their citizens or on the extension of their trade" (i. 13).

After comparing the prosperity of the English borough with that of the short-lived success of the French Communes, she goes on in the same strain : "Against the century of growth and the century of decay which made up the record of the French Communes, we have to set up three hundred years of unbroken prosperity and privilege in which the English burghers added charter to charter, and filled their 'common chests' with a regularity that knew no check" (i. 31).

The writer of this article would like to be able to share Mrs. Green's enthusiasm in respect both of the uninterrupted prosperity of the fifteenth-century borough, and the popular nature of its government. But, unfortunately, there is another aspect of this subject which our author is not at sufficient pains to examine.

It is true that, towards the close of her second volume, Mrs. Green somewhat tardily recognizes what had been better placed on an earlier page, namely, the strong oligarchical character of the much-vaunted town constitution, and the chequered fate of its boasted free career ; but, at the same time, Mrs. Green fails to recognize the fact that this aristocratic governing class, who in the fifteenth century ruled the towns with a rod of iron, had little in common with the democracy which defied Church, State, and Baronage in the thirteenth, and which, in the period of which Mrs. Green writes, was again engaged in a bitter internecine warfare with the exclusive official oligarchy which, under pretence of citizenship, monopolized the wealth, freedom, and franchise of the borough. It was not so much the fortress of a feudal baronage, as the impregnable stronghold of the rich privileged higher

class, against which the great mass of the democracy surged so un-availingly in the fifteenth century.

Similarly, in her anxiety to emphasize the wealth and independence of the fifteenth-century borough, Mrs. Green utterly ignores the annals which record the town's material loss and misfortune. She fails to observe how dearly it bought its freedom, or how frequently the heavy term at which it was assessed entailed financial ruin in times which, owing to the devastations of war and pestilence, can scarcely have been so prosperous as Mrs. Green would have us think.

She quotes the decay of Winchester as an utterly abnormal event, and closes her account of it with the astonishing remark that "*nowhere in any considerable city do we find a parallel to the utter ruin of this unfortunate community*"¹ (i. 327). Surely Mrs. Green cannot have forgotten York, whose fee-ferm in 1487 was allowed to fall from £160 to £18 5s.;² or Bristol, which in 1225 let for a term of £245, and which in 1461-2 was assessed—and that on a lease of sixty years longer—at £157, nearly ninety pounds less than the one it had compounded for more than two hundred years before! What about the condition of Southampton, which Mrs. Green is constrained to notice, but in a totally different connection? We read that "in 1376 the poor commons and tenants prayed that the King would take the town into his hand and forgive them the rent; . . . and in 1468 it fell again into arrears, when, for lack of tolls, . . . the burghers *had been forced to borrow £400 for their rent, and many citizens had been driven from the town, and others were going unless something could be done to lighten their burdens*"³ (ii. 304). In a note on the same page, Mrs. Green adds, quite casually, that "the Southampton trade did in fact utterly fail before a century was over." Yet York, Bristol, Southampton, and Winchester were four of the most "considerable" towns of the realm!

Indeed, we cannot afford to ignore the fact that in the fifteenth century the decay of towns was widespread. There *was* life and growth, but it was stunted and retarded by the accumulated mass of dead material overlaying it. Mrs. Green notices the rebuilding and repaving of a few towns, but the great mass of them seems about this time to have been in a frightful condition of waste and ruin.⁴ The cause of this is not very far to seek, although Mrs. Green is at a loss to account for it. She somewhat inconsistently ascribes the decay of

¹ The italics here and elsewhere are my own.—A. L.

² *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, vi. 390.

³ *Statutes of the Realm*, 26 Hen. VIII., c. 8; 27 Hen. VIII., c. 1; 32 Hen. VIII., c. 18, 19; 33 Hen. VIII., c. 36; 35 Hen. VIII., c. 4.

Winchester to "the hopeless situation of the municipality before the rival authorities of the city, especially before the powerful lords of convent and cathedral" (i. 326). She quotes from the petition of the inhabitants in 1450, which spoke of the desolation of streets and houses. Had Mrs. Green read a little further she would have seen the cause to which the inhabitants themselves ascribed their misfortunes; "... now *through frequent plagues* and (consequent) withdrawal of citizens and merchants so ruined."¹

Winchester had in fact never recovered from the ravages of the Black Death, which visited the seaport towns before any other. The same thing had happened in Bristol, where we learn "there died in a manner the whole strength of the town, seized as it were by a sudden death. . . . After this aforesaid pestilence many buildings fell to the ground entirely ruined for want of inhabitants . . . in like manner many villages and hamlets were desolate."²

A study of contemporary records reveals the same thing. Take, for instance, the *Inquisition into the Decay of Richmond* in 1438: "Moreover they say upon oath that the said town of Richmond, before the said grant and confirmation aforesaid, and afterwards, was so greatly inhabited by many wealthy burgesses, merchants, artificers, victuallers, and other powerful inhabitants. . . . Moreover they say that very many of the burgesses . . . and other inhabitants of the said town of Richmond have been destroyed by pestilence and epidemic; *that they have not been able to pay the said fee-ferm rent of £40; that many people have left the town . . . so that many of the houses are waste and desolate.*"³

Or compare the case of Cambridge, where, in 1385, the burgesses represented to the king that, in consequence of two accidental fires, "many persons had quitted the town, and many others proposed to do so unless they had speedy succour . . . by means whereof the burgesses could not pay the king's ferm, etc.;"⁴ and, again, in 1402, they complained that they could not pay their ferm: "*The town was impoverished by the loss of its franchises, the increase of its ancient fermes, the sudden mischief of fire, and other great evils, as also by the diminution of the people in the town since the forfeiture of Richard II.*"⁵

No doubt the Great Plague, which so severely visited the town in the middle of the fourteenth century, largely contributed to the devastation here complained of. In 1423 the receipts of the town

¹ *Inspecimus*, by Ed. IV., of letters patent of Hen. VI.

² Seyer, *Bristol*, ii. 144.

³ Harrison, *Yorkshire*, p. 33.

⁴ Cooper, *Annals of Cambridge*, vol. i., p. 129.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

were only £22 17s. 0½d.¹ The evidence could be multiplied, but enough has, perhaps, been quoted to refute Mrs. Green's theory as to the universal and uninterrupted prosperity of the mediæval towns. Nor does an examination of the industrial revolution of the fifteenth century support Mrs. Green's theory about the universal sharing of trader's profits. The king may possibly have had a part in them, but the peasant was the very last person to be considered. His extremity was the trader's opportunity, who from it sucked no small advantage. All revolutions are wrought at the expense of some class, and in the fourteenth century, as at the beginning of the nineteenth, it was the hired labourer and hired artisan or journeyman who immediately suffered. Mrs. Green notices the organization of industry in "the first rude form of a factory system" (ii. 89). Often an employer of industry "forsook the manufacturing towns for some rural district where labour was plentiful, and where he could escape the heavy municipal dues which his business could ill afford to pay" (ii. 88). Something like our modern "sweating system" doubtless went on. The rural populations, attracted by the novelty of industry, and thrown out of employment by the wholesale conversion of arable lands into pasture, flocked to the centres of industry, which consequently came to be thronged by a glut of unskilled workmen, clamouring for employment and denouncing the skilled foreigners who took their place. Speaking of this miserable class, Mrs. Green says: "We know also that before 1340 one manufacturing town at least . . . owned its miserable race of labourers, who worked by the day at a bare-subsistence wage of a penny, an outcast people, whose abject poverty was their only protection" (ii. 101). We find these outcasts, combining from sheer misery, "dreary groups of labourers seething with inarticulate discontent" (ii. 107).

But here is one of Mrs. Green's inconsistencies; for if these people had shared in the universal wealth and prosperity, as Mrs. Green affirms they did, why was discontent and combination so necessary?

These facts point rather to a hypothesis contrary to the one put forward by Mrs. Green—to the hypothesis that this period of commercial revolution and prosperity was paralleled by a corresponding one of misery and ruin. The success of the cloth-merchants, as Mrs. Green herself admits (i. 51), was wrought at the expense of the wool-staplers, and the reaping of the middleman left no gleanings for the poorer class. But certainly there can be no doubt that, in the fifteenth century, the poverty and desperate misery of the peasant and

¹ Rot. Comp. Thesaur. Vill. Cantab., 1 and 2 Hen. VI.

poorest artisan class was a very present source of danger to the commonwealth.

One of the most marked features of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was the disposition evinced on all sides to break away from the old lines of trade. The old rules and regulations of commerce were beginning to be felt onerous, and injurious to the expansion of trade. Men wanted to be allowed *free competition* in the matter of buying or selling, working or hiring, and free use of what material they chose. The national impulse towards internal *free trade* is abundantly revealed in the legislation—whether Parliamentary or corporate—which was directed occasionally towards its encouragement, but more frequently towards its repression. Take, for example, the Statutes of Herrings, by which Government sought to regulate the too eager bargains of cunning fish-dealers at the Yarmouth and Blackeney fish fairs. In 1357 it was enacted that herrings should not be forestalled at sea, and that the fishermen might sell their merchandise to whomsoever they pleased at the fair; and that “no vessel called *Pyker*, of London, nor of any other place, shall enter the said haven [to abate] the fair in damage of the people; . . . and that the fishers be compelled to bring all the remnant of their herring to the said fair to sell there; so that none sell herring in any place about the haven of Yarmouth . . . unless it be herring of their own fishing.”¹ The statute concerning the salt fish of Blackeney (1357) similarly enacted “that the ships called Doggers or Lode ships . . . shall discharge their fish within the haven of Blackeney and in none other place upon forfeit of fish and pain of imprisonment.”²

These and similar regulations seem to point to the fact that there had been many attempts to discharge and sell fish wherever a profitable market offered itself, and that this new line of dealing was resented by the accustomed buyers and traders of Yarmouth and Blackeney. Similarly, the number of regulations by which labourers and artisans were strictly prohibited from hiring themselves to the highest wage given, from selling above a certain price, or charging more than a given sum for given work (*e.g.* tailoring); from working by night; from selling privately, or forestalling goods on their way to market, or selling except at markets³—all these point to the tendency in favour of free trade and free competition which characterized the period. This system of rigid prohibition naturally led to a corresponding

¹ *Statutes of the Realm* (31 Ed. III., st. 2; 35 Ed. III.), vol. i., pp. 353, 369.

² *Ibid.* (32 Ed. III., st. 3), vol. i., p. 355.

³ Riley, *Memorials of London in the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Centuries*.

system of fraud and evasion. The documents of the period are filled with declarations against trade deceits and false dealing.¹ There were without doubt a great number of dishonest tradesmen whose system of dealing was based on fraud. One example of this among many is afforded by the petition of the burgesses of Cambridge, in 1423, to the effect that "in the city of London and in the suburbs thereof, divers persons occupying the craft of broiderie, make divers works of broiderie of insufficient stuff, and unduly wrought, . . . and such works, so untruly made by such persons aforesaid, dreading the search of the Wardens of Broiderie in the city of London, keepen and senden to the fairs of Sturbridge, etc." ²

Reference to the fraudulent dealing of this period is made some two hundred years later, in the seventeenth century, in a tract addressed to all the clothiers of England,³ by the deputy aulneger of that day. After praising the earnest endeavour of the first clothiers to keep the work good and the trade honest, he goes on: "Whilst this course continued the trade flourished, . . . but corrupting time . . . not only infected some of this fraternity with the knowledge of deceit, but also stirred other intruders in this trade, who, greedy of such apparent gain, . . . usurped the name of clothiers, . . . well studied in fraud."

Mrs. Green notices how even members of the town corporations were not altogether free from the desire of fraudulent gain, and were as eager as any to secure the larger profits which accrued from monopoly, regrating, and forestalling of merchandise. "Bakers and victuallers," we read, "who rose to municipal offices, turned the assize of bread and the inspection of cooking-houses and fish-stalls into an idle tale" (ii. 49). "In the hands of merchants," says Mrs. Green, "the laws of buying and selling were manipulated so as to interfere neither with the free circulation of goods, nor with the instinct of the dealer to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest" (ii. 49). As a matter of fact the legislation of the day could not keep pace with the needs of the community. The machinery of Government was inadequate to cope with the ever-increasing demand upon its powers. Indeed, it is rather a matter of wonder that with such a simple organization it achieved so much.

With characteristic inconsistency Mrs. Green alternately condemns and commends the fifteenth-century governmental trade policy. At

¹ Riley, *Memorials of London in the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Centuries*.

² *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, iv. 255.

³ *British Museum Catalogue*, 8245 f., F. 25712.

one time she refers to a State which was "perfectly indifferent" (i. 90) to the welfare of the merchant adventurer, to a State protection which was "dim and shadowy compared with the duties and responsibilities thrown on the townspeople themselves" (i. 125); and elsewhere, speaking of the Government, she writes: "The English manufacturer and English working man were its recognized charge, and in their interest no measure was considered too heroic, and no detail too insignificant, whether the matter in hand was the closing of English markets to a whole people, or the decision of how big a price of leather it might be well in the interest of the shoemaking trade to allow the cobbler to buy for the patching of an old boot" (i. 72).

In this and in a succeeding paragraph Mrs. Green at length does justice to a Government that was, if anything, *ultra* paternal in its trade policy: "Drawn hither and thither by the new conflict of public opinion, and the passion of rival interests, baffled by the insoluble problem of how to frame laws which should benefit equally all the claimants for its aid, . . . the Government," says Mrs. Green, "hesitatingly felt its way along an ill-defined path, veering from side to side according to the direction of the last impelling force" (i. 71, 72).

In dealing with the town market, Mrs. Green passes with very slight notice over a very characteristic feature of mediæval times: the *fairs*. She refers to the great fair of St. Giles' at Winchester, not in its commercial aspect, but merely in reference to the conflict between the rival authorities which claimed jurisdiction there during its continuance. By a special charter of Edward III.¹ (1349), the Bishop of Winchester and his officers were to have supreme authority over the city and fair during the whole period of its duration, to the complete exclusion of the municipality. The fair, by this charter, was to last for sixteen days, during which time "no tradesman of Winchester or other man shall sell or offer for sale any merchandise or goods in the city." "And though Southampton," it went on, "is more than seven leagues distant from the fair, still the Justiciaries shall send an officer of the Bishop's Pavilion, the Marshall, thither each year . . . to proclaim there that no man shall at that time sell or buy goods, or weigh or poise merchandise or goods for sale in Southampton excepting victuals . . . but that all traders shall bring their goods and merchandise to the fair."²

But it soon became obvious that these special privileges accorded to the Bishop of Winchester were highly detrimental to the ordinary business of the inhabitants, and caused more grievous dislocation of trade than could be put right by the profits accruing from the fair.

¹ Charter of 23 Ed. III. See also *Winchester Cathedral Records*, No. 2.

² *Winchester Cathedral Records*, p. 52

Dr. Kitchin, in his introduction to Edward III.'s Charter (p. 21), remarks concerning it: "The regulations of the fair were, on every hand, arbitrary and oppressive, and if it relieved the city from royal exactions, it at the same time destroyed its independence." Elsewhere he observes how (p. 23), in the time of the great Civil War of the Roses, "*it was seen to be much decayed.*" "In the Revenue Roll of William Wayneflete for 1471," continues Dr. Kitchin, "we hear of the Cornish Street being unoccupied, and the receipts of the fair had largely fallen off; as we have said, the times and the growth of larger marts were against it; the conditions of trade were changing. . . shops in towns grew stronger as the fair grew weaker." Dr. Kitchin goes on to ascribe the decline of the fair to the greater prominence of the middleman, and to the improvements in communication.

From whatever cause, these great local marts seem to have been greatly decayed in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The fair of St. Botolph at Boston was one of the most famous in England. Like the other great local fairs, it was largely frequented by foreign merchants, who had booths and stalls there. In 1319 we read that the Venetian trader Nicoletto Basadona went to St. Botolph's fair.¹ In 1336 a patent grant of protection was issued to a number of German merchants and fourteen ships coming to the fair of St. Botolph.² Yet, in 1334, the shops and stalls produced not more than £100, and at this date we are told, "foreigners came not there as they were wont to do."³ In 1416 we learn, from an "order that the court of hustings shall no longer be closed for the month ensuing after the feast of S. Botolph—That whereas from of old it had been the custom in the said city every year, for one month after the feast of S. Botolph the Abbot [June 17th], to hold no Husting therein [the City of London], for the reason, that very many persons as well as citizens of the said city, as others, who had suits and pleas pending at the Husting, resorted every year to the market or fair of S. Botolph, then being held at Bostone, for the purpose of trading there, *Now for many years past the holding of such fair* which was the cause of so putting off the Husting, as before stated, *had entirely ceased.*"⁴ Even as early as

¹ *Calendar of State Papers—Venetian; Voyages of the Gallies*, 1319. Brown, vol. i., p. 2.

² Thompson, *Collections for an Account of Boston*, p. 104.

³ *Inquis. post mortem*, No. 70.

⁴ Riley, *Memorials of London*, p. 637; also 4 Hen. V., 1416; *Letter Bk. I.*, fol. clxxvi. (Latin).

1357 it was necessary to "defend" the fair of Great Yarmouth.¹ The fairs of Cambridgeshire, however, died hard. Sturbridge fair continued very fairly prosperous down into the sixteenth century, when Elizabeth renewed its charter (1588).

In 1419 there was a suit between the Mayor and the Chancellor of Cambridge as to the supervision of weights and measures of the citizens of London coming to Sturbridge fair. About this time the fair had acquired a celebrity as a mart for costly embroidery; and, in 1425, "the accounts of Richard Parentyn, Prior of Burcester in Oxfordshire, and Richard Albon, Canon and Bursar of that House for the year ending Michaelmas, 1425, contain several items, which show the varied and extensive trade of Sturbridge fair about this time."² Even as late as 1533-4 the importance of the fish trade at Sturbridge fair appears by an Act of Parliament to prevent the forestalling and regrating of fish in that and other fairs in the neighbourhood [Ely, Sturbridge, and St. Ives], "being the most notable fairs within this realm for provisions of fish."³

The casual reader of history will be at a loss to reconcile this theory of the decline of fairs with the numerous fresh grants of fairs and markets which were made throughout the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries. But the explanation is to be found in the supposition that towards the fifteenth century fairs *began to change in character*. The termly marts which it was usual to grant, together with a weekly market, either to the townspeople or to the lord of the manor, were scarcely of the same character as the great yearly fairs of St. Bartholomew, St. Botolph, St. Giles, or Sturbridge, to which merchants resorted from all parts of Europe. These great annual gatherings usually lasted from two to three weeks, whereas the smaller town fairs only lasted from one to three days, and were frequented merely by the local people who dwelt in their neighbourhood. They were usually held, like their predecessors, on the festival of the saint near whose churchyard they took up their position.

Towards the end of the fifteenth and the middle of the sixteenth centuries they tended more and more to become mere excuses, not for trade, but for holiday making, and are denounced as places of undesirable resort by many writers of the time. Holinshed writes of them: "I set down here so many of our fairs as I have found out by my own observation, and help of others in this behalf. Certes it is

¹ 31 Ed. III., stat. 2 (*Statutes of the Realm*, vol. i., p. 353).

² Cooper, *Annals of Cambridge*, p. 173; and Brand, *Popular Antiquities*, p. 554 (London, 1888).

³ Stat. 25 Hen. VIII., c. 4.

impossible for us to come by all, sith there is almost no town in England but hath one or more such marts holden yearly in the same, although . . . little else [be] bought or sold in them more than good drinke, pies, and some pedlerie trash ; wherefore it were no loss if divers of them were abolished. Neither do I see whereunto this number of *paltrie fairs* tendeth so much as to the corruption of youth, who (all other business set apart) must needs repaire unto them, whereby they often spend not only the weekdays but also the Lord's sabbath in great vanity and riot. But such hath been the iniquity of ancient times."¹

A tract, published in 1641, setting forth the glories of St. Bartholomew fair, illustrates how that ancient mart had sunk in dignity almost to the level of one of those "paltrie fairs" which Holinshed condemns. The writer observes: "It is remarkable . . . to behold and hear the strange sights and confused noise in the faire. Here a knave in a fool's coat, with a trumpet sounding or a drumme beating, invites you to see his puppets, . . . and all these make such a distracted noise that you would think Babell were not comparable to it."²

The Puritan Revolution doubtless dealt a severe blow at fairs. In 1651, for example, a printed Parliamentary resolution illustrates how St. James's Fair, Westminster, was "forborne" in that year; and "is not to be kept until Parliament shall take farther order."³ There is also a scarce tract of 1709, entitled *Reasons for suppressing the Yearly Fair in Brookfield, Westminster, commonly called May Fair.*³

These last quotations may seem a little wide of the mark, but they sufficiently indicate the direction in which the keeping of fairs began to tend about this time, and the holiday rather than business character they began to assume even as early as the fifteenth century. A study of fifteenth century fairs is, further, important with regard to the sudden increase of wealth in the hands of the merchant class. Mrs. Green, while insisting on the doubling and trebling of the country's wealth, does not sufficiently inquire into the causes which gave rise to it. She refers it, in a vague, undefined way, to the commercial and industrial revolution, but omits to notice this decline of the fairs as a marked feature of that revolution. It is true the fifteenth-century merchants had accumulated wealth, and were able to make it flow into what channels they pleased ; but the one selected was not, as heretofore, that of the great local fairs.

Mrs. Green notices at some length the fifteenth-century outcry

¹ Page 244.

² Brand, *Popular Antiquities*, pp. 556, 557.

against foreigners, but fails to connect this outcry with the English merchant's increasing prosperity, and does not show very clearly how *their withdrawal was the English trader's opportunity*. The rise of the *English* middleman was a great characteristic of the new condition of things. Whether the withdrawal of foreigners was the cause or effect of the decline of the fairs, the fact of their decay is a very important indication of a briskness of exchange, and a multiplication of traffic, which could no longer be satisfied with the old routine of a highly protected commerce.

That the theory of the withdrawal of foreigners from England in the fourteenth century is no mere fiction of the imagination, may be deduced from such evidence as is afforded, for instance, by the Venetian State Papers of the time. The whole energy of the Doge and his council was directed to prevent the galleys which sailed yearly to Flanders from visiting England. In 1317, the galleys were "not to go to England unless the agreement be stipulated."¹ In 1332, "*the galleys must not by any means go to England.*"¹ In 1374, a special embassy—which, however, was never sent—was arranged for, with instructions to deceive the English king on the subject of the galleys visiting England. If much pressed by the king, the ambassador was instructed to prevaricate, to promise a visit from them in the next year; but, if possible, he was to get out of the matter without arranging for their coming to England at all.¹

Towards the beginning of the fifteenth century, however, they began to come more regularly. In treating of the commercial revolution which so developed the foreign trade of England with the Continent, Mrs. Green refers to the companies of German and Flemish merchants in London, and to the galleys of Florence, Genoa, and Venice which came here; but she *utterly ignores the great trade route of Rouen*, which at this time was the main highway of traffic between England, France, and the North of Italy.

Mrs. Green's work raises many other debateable points which the limitations of space will not permit me to go into. One, among others, is the questionable poverty of the nobles, upon which Mrs. Green lays much stress; whereas we know that many of them were extensive *wool growers*,² and others—for example, the very Berkeleys whose financial extremities she recounts at length—took to trading by the middle of the fourteenth century, and could scarcely, therefore, have been so much reduced in the fifteenth, as from Mrs. Green's statements we might infer.

¹ *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian, etc.*, pp. 3, 7, 13.

² *Statutes of the Realm*.

In conclusion, it only remains to compliment Mrs. Green upon the fascinating subject she has chosen, and to express the hope that, in a succeeding volume, she will contribute yet more valuable evidence, dug from an area of research which, by her own confession, is still clouded in the thick darkness of obscurity. Her present work, if it has not carried the matter any further, has yet arranged such material as lay to hand in a very pleasing and readable form, which, while affording little new instruction to the eager student of these things, must prove highly acceptable to the general reader.

ALICE LAW.

NOTES AND MEMORANDA.

THE CO-OPERATIVE CONGRESS OF 1894.—The Twenty-sixth Annual Co-operative Congress was held at Sunderland during Whitsuntide, it being also the jubilee year of the movement dating from the Rochdale Pioneers, and upwards of eight hundred delegates were present. On Saturday morning there was a meeting of the Central Co-operative Board, when the report of the year's work from the various sections was discussed previous to its being submitted to the Congress. Considerable discussion took place over a paragraph which appeared in the Report concerning certain productive societies in the Midland Section. Objection was taken to the starting of productive societies, by trade-union branches and other labour or political organizations, on lines which appear to conflict with existing co-operative societies. These new societies, according to the Secretary of the Union, Mr. Gray, are "engaging in production neither from the producer's nor consumer's point of view." And again : "The system is diametrically opposed to Co-operation."

It appears that they propose to sell their goods in the open market, and some propose to open retail shops for this purpose. The profits are to go to build up a common fund for the extension of the business, and in a few cases may be used for furthering political objects. It is difficult to see why such a system should be diametrically opposed to co-operation, unless the word is to be used in an extremely narrow sense. The men in these societies are sincere, and believe their form of co-operation to be the best. What the leaders of the movement should consider is, whether they cannot use their influence to put them upon a more practical footing. The chief objection to them seems to be that they lack the essential conditions to secure permanence. In the present state of society it is not a sound policy to organize an industrial concern upon the basis of holding all capital in common. Provident, and Reserve, and similar funds are very desirable, but beyond a certain point they are dangerous and tend to exclusiveness. Neither is it advisable to directly identify a manufacturing organization with any particular political party. It was ultimately agreed that the matter

should be put into the hands of the Parliamentary Committees of the Co-operative Union and the Trade-union Congress.

On Saturday afternoon the Exhibition of Co-operative Productions was opened by the Bishop of Durham. It was a decided improvement on previous years. One of the most interesting exhibits was that of the Brownfield Guild Pottery Society. If only for the purpose of improving the appearance of co-operative exhibitions one would wish this society success. It is difficult, at the best of times, to make boots, cloth, and other similar commodities attractive to the average co-operator, who judges by outside appearances rather than the underlying principle ; but in the Brownfield Guild Pottery's productions we have all that could be desired, for they are both artistic and useful.

There was, however, one feature in the Exhibition which, to a certain extent, detracts from its value in the eyes of many. The Exhibition is supposed to be one of goods produced by co-operative organizations, but we find that one large society, the English Wholesale Society, exhibited pottery made by a private firm. There seems to be little excuse for such a step in this case, because the class of goods were already being manufactured by a Co-operative Productive Society which has already obtained a reputation for the excellent quality of its productions. It would be well for those who have the organizing of such exhibitions to consider seriously whether they are not doing the movement an injury by giving a false impression of it in this way.

The Bishop, in opening the Exhibition, alluded to the obligations of the consumer when purchasing goods, and it is decidedly encouraging to see what progress the principle of fair dealing is making. After the opening of the Exhibition the Bishop addressed a large meeting at the Victoria Hall, where he strongly supported labour co-partnership as a peaceful solution of industrial difficulties. He said : " Co-operation defines the right relation, not only of the members of a society one to another, but of men as men bound together in the fellowship of one nature, one life, one destiny. Co-operation is the harmonious action of men and classes and nations, bringing together the ripe results of their powers, their endowments, their opportunities for the good of the race as fellow-workers, for the establishment of a Divine unity, the crown of common service, and the reward of individual labour. . . . Thus, in seeking for improvements in the conditions of industry and commerce, we shall not think simply of higher wages or of cheaper production, or of the advancement of one class, but rather of reconciling interests which appear to be conflicting, of developing trustful fellowship between those who have to fulfil different functions ; of making labour itself, in all its forms, a true human life, and not only a provision for a

living. An ideal co-operative production includes in one fellowship all who are engaged in any work, however different in function, and gives to all a proportionate share in the profits of the business and in the control of the administration." The Bishop's eloquent address was well received, and must have inspired those present to strive to work out that higher side of co-operation which it so ably set before them.

On Monday the business of Congress began. Mr. Tweddell, Chairman of the Newcastle Branch of the English Wholesale Society, presiding. In his inaugural address, Mr. Tweddell dwelt at length with the two conflicting principles which have divided the Congress for many years, *i.e.* the consumer *v.* co-partnership of labour theories, and strongly supported the former. Unfortunately or otherwise, the President's Address is not open to debate at the Congress, or there would have been delegates ready to question the propositions it contained. "Profit on cost," said Mr. Tweddell, "I look upon as one of the many devices which human ingenuity has contrived to enable one section of the community to appropriate wealth produced by another. It is, in short, just what the consumer can ultimately be induced or persuaded or cajoled or diddled into parting with."

Political economists have written volumes, in order to explain their different views of profit, and the definitions are numerous; but this is certainly a new one. It may be true that some people make a profit by defrauding the public, and that these members of society are more numerous than is desirable; but that all those who rely upon profit for a livelihood are merely diddling the public, and not rendering any service, is a rather big statement to make. It would be interesting to know how Mr. Tweddell arrives at the "cost" of an article; in fact, until one has a clearer definition of what is meant by the terms "cost" and "profit" in this inaugural address, much of it will not be understood.

Reference was made in the address to the remarkable progress made during the past century in the direction of improving the means of production: "As we listened to the ceaseless throb of the patient and tireless slaves which it has subjected to our command—digging in the mine, working in the factory, ploughing in the field, skimming the earth with the fleetness of the wind, or patiently plunging through the billows of the boundless ocean,—as we contemplated, in short, the vast and varied forces which modern invention and discovery have harnessed in the service of the human race," etc.

Following this, it was submitted that the system which makes the consumer the basis of its organization and gives him complete control, and the total profit beyond "cost," whatever that may

mean, was the best. Now, whether the consumer is the best basis upon which to reorganize industry, is an open question; but what one would like to know is to what extent have organized consumers in the past helped to bring about the wonderful improvements referred to. "One hundred and twenty-four men employed in Dunstan Wholesale Society's Mill," said the president, "are able to produce five thousand sacks of flour per week, or enough to supply a population of two hundred thousand people; sixteen hundred workers engaged at the Leicester Wholesale Shoe Works will supply three hundred thousand individuals with boots." How has this been made possible?—by the energy and ceaseless activity of the organized consumer, or by that of the men whose reward has been the "profit" which Mr. Tweddell abuses so much? Mr. Tweddell has evidently only understood one side of co-operation as yet. The advocates of profit-sharing and co-partnership, whom he condemns in strong language, whilst recognizing that competition gives the giant intellects too much power and often too large a return, also see that the great progress that has been made has been to a large extent due to the fact that the reward of the inventor, the organizer, and pioneer has been linked to his labour; and what they ask is, that, instead of this applying to the few, the great body of workers should be enfranchised and reorganized as partners in profits and responsibilities. Such a principle is not opposed to the Rochdale plan of co-operation, but is rather a necessary development of it.

It is regrettable that Mr. Tweddell could not have quoted from some more impartial writer in support of his theory than one who has no better name for an employer who willingly takes his workers into partnership with him, with a view to training them to take charge of their industry, than that of a dictator making his own position secure. The same writer brands in a contemptuous manner one of the most successful productive societies in the country—one that has done, perhaps, more than any other to better the condition of the workers in its trade—as a body of small masters sweating their fellow men.

In the afternoon, a paper on Store Management was read and discussed. On Tuesday the Annual Report of the Central Board came up for consideration, and some important resolutions were passed in connection with it, dealing with Bogus Societies, the Credit System, the Evening Schools Continuation Code, and the Factory Acts. The following resolution was also passed concerning monopolies and public companies: "That this Congress is of opinion that it is desirable to prevent the creation of public monopolies, by reserving

co-operative rights for the public *and the workers* in any act conferring exceptional privileges, and that the Parliamentary Committee be requested to take steps to have this subject fully discussed during the ensuing year."

This is an important step in the direction of co-partnership for the Congress to take, and it is difficult to see why the delegates should unanimously agree to the desirability of bodies with which they are only indirectly connected applying co-partnership, when so many vote against applying it themselves. The voting on the following resolution was so close that the chairman could not say how it had gone: "That the Central Co-operative Board be instructed to take steps for giving effect to the resolution of the 1893 Congress in favour of co-partnership, by giving notice to all federal bodies with which the Co-operative Union is in membership of a resolution to be moved in the name of the Union requesting each such Federal Society to admit its employees to co-partnership."

On Wednesday a resolution protesting against the action of the Midland Railway Company in debarring their servants from serving as officials of co-operative societies was passed.

Following this, Mr. Campbell, a veteran co-operator of eighty-four years of age, read a paper on Co-operative Agriculture, urging co-operative societies to supply their own needs in this direction.

The departure made a few years ago in the selection of presidents has not met with universal approval. There was a time when outside men of wide learning and broad sympathies were invited to give the inaugural address, but now they are found from within, and, on the whole, the change has not been an improvement. There is something attractive in selecting men for posts of honour from your own body, but men like Dr. Lightfoot, Lord Derby, Professor Marshall, and others, were able to take a large-minded view of the movement, and bring into it new thoughts and ideas, and lift it above the purely partisan view of matters. Each year, however, since the new step was taken, men have been appointed who deliberately and avowedly set themselves to advocate one side of a keenly debated topic, making this the basis of their address, and the movement is the poorer for it.

HENRY VIVIAN.

BUILDING SOCIETIES BILLS.—Two bills relating to Building Societies were referred by the House of Commons to its Committee on Law—one brought in, on behalf of the Government, by Mr. Herbert Gladstone (Building Societies Bill No. 2), in favour of which

Mr. Jackson gracefully withdrew one previously brought in by himself (Building Societies Bill No. 1), and another brought in by Sir John Lubbock, on behalf, it is understood, of the body known as the Building Societies Committee (Building Societies Bill No. 3). The question thus lay virtually between the Treasury benches of the present and the last Government on the one side, and a respectable, but interested body, representing almost exclusively the large permanent societies, on the other. The two measures have indeed much in common, but of the fifteen clauses of Sir John Lubbock's bill six are identical with those of the Government bill, and four are equivalent to other provisions contained in it. As against these fifteen clauses however, there are twenty-three, or, including one added in committee, twenty-four in the Government bill. The Government bill (adopted by the committee as a basis for discussion and reported with amendments, May 24, 1894) is with some alterations (one important) the same as that of last session. Clause 1 specifies the matters to be contained in rules. Clause 2 provides for the annual account and statement, fixing a date (December 31st) for the period to which, in the case of future societies, it is to relate. Clause 3 requires one auditor at least to be a public accountant. Clause 4 enables the Registrar, on the application of ten members of not less than twelve months' standing, to appoint an accountant or actuary to inspect the books and report thereon, the applicants depositing the costs of inspection. Clause 5 enables the Registrar, with the consent of the Secretary of State, on the application of one-tenth of the members, or of a hundred members when the number exceeds a thousand, to appoint an inspector to examine into and report upon the affairs of the society, or to call a special meeting, and to exercise such powers without application in certain specified cases, with the consent of the Secretary of State. Clause 6 authorizes the cancelling or suspension of registry in certain cases. Clause 7 enables the Registrar, on the like application as under clause 6, to dissolve a society after investigating its affairs. Clause 8 provides that a building society shall be deemed to be a company within the meaning of the Companies Winding up Act, 1890, and allows pending proceedings in the County Court to be transferred to the High Court. Clause 9 defines the position of liquidators in cases of winding up under the rules, or by consent of three-fourths of the members. Clause 10, in the two latter cases, provides for sending the account and balance-sheet to the Registrar. Clause 11 forbids advances by ballot in new societies, and makes provision for facilitating the discontinuance of such advances in existing societies (this is new). Clause 12 prohibits advances on second

mortgage, unless the prior mortgage is in favour of the society, with an exception as to societies in Scotland already authorized by rule, the directors making the advance being made jointly and severally liable for any loss. Under clause 13, where payments on a mortgage are over twelve months in arrear, or where the society is in possession, the amounts secured are not to be reckoned for the purpose of ascertaining the society's power to receive deposits or loans at interest. Clause 14 forbids a building society to use any but its registered name, or to accept deposits, except on the terms that not less than one month's notice may be required before repayment. Clause 15 defines who may take proceedings under section 31 of the Act of 1874. Clause 16 facilitates proceedings for union of societies, or transfer of engagements. Clause 17 provides that the stating of a special case shall not be compulsory on arbitrators. Clauses 18 and 19 provide for the punishment of offences by societies and their officers. Clause 20 applies sect. 40 of the Building Societies Act, 1874 (requiring yearly statements to be made, and copies sent to the Registrar), to societies certified under the Act of 1836, and repeals that Act as to societies certified after 1855, on the expiration of two years from the passing of the bill, the Birkbeck Society thus obtaining the maintenance of a mass of obsolete law for its benefit. Clause 21 requires the Chief Registrar to submit to the Secretary of State an annual report of the proceedings of the Registrars under the Building Societies Acts, such report to be laid before Parliament. Clauses 22 and 23 are formal. By the new clause 24 the Act is to come into operation on January 1, 1895. A first schedule states the particulars to be set forth in the annual statement (i.) in the case of a mortgage where the present debt exceeds £5000, and (ii.) in case of property of which the society is in possession. Schedule 2 specifies repealed enactments.

In the Building Societies Bill No. 3 the main differences are that it sets out in a schedule the form of the whole annual liabilities account, giving the Registrar power to vary such form in certain cases (clause 3); that it makes no provision for its being made up to a fixed date in the case of new societies; that it makes sums illegally borrowed in excess of the statutory limit recoverable from the society (clause 71); that it only allows an investigation into the affairs of the society to take place on a requisition signed by twenty members of twelve months' standing, holding each not less than £50 paid-up unadvanced shares, and requires the investigation to be made by the Registrar (clause 8)—an almost impracticable provision,—and defers for two years any application whatever of the Act to certified societies. It contains no provisions for even such inspection of books as is allowed by clause 4 of

the Government bill, nor for special meetings on the Registrar's direction, nor for cancelling or suspension of registry, nor for enabling the Registrar to dissolve societies after investigation, nor for limiting advances by ballot, nor any general clause, such as is essentially needed, as to offences by building societies and their officers.

In the interest of the public, the Government bill is immeasurably superior to the other. But it contains one most unfortunate provision—that requiring the Registrar to report separately on Building Societies through the Secretary of State. The result of this can only be to facilitate the hushing-up of Building Society scandals, and to sever unnaturally Building Societies from other cognate bodies with which the Registrar has to do. The broad and simple provision of Lord Iddesleigh's Friendly Societies Act of 1875, requiring the Chief Registrar to lay every year before Parliament "a report of his proceedings, and of those of the Assistant Registrars, and of the principal matters transacted by them," etc., ought not to be departed from. I cannot, moreover, but regret that, in the face of the further disclosures of the last twelvemonth, the right of inspection of books by members, under proper safeguards, should not have been recognized.

J. M. LUDLOW.

"BUILDING SOCIETIES AND PROPERTIES IN POSSESSION," ordered by the House of Commons to be printed April 3, 1894. This Return required the societies to show the original valuation of aggregate of properties in possession at the date of the society's last account; the aggregate amount of advances made on properties in possession at the date of such account; the aggregate amount of debts due on properties when possession was taken; the amount included in assets in respect of properties in possession at the date of the account; the gross income for the year by way of rents, etc., derived from properties in possession at the date of the account; and the gross outgoings for the year on the properties in possession at the date of the account. The result is remarkable in various ways. Out of 2371 societies in the United Kingdom, 1436 return no properties in possession, 725 make a return of such properties, and 211 made no return,¹ notwithstanding repeated applications by the Secretary of State, the recalcitrants including many large societies in the Metropolitan counties, Lancashire, Northumberland, and York. The figures given must thus be considerably below the mark; yet it

¹ There is, however, a mistake in the adding up on p. 84, according to which $202 + 8 + 3 + 6$ are totted up as 220, from which 9 subsequently received returns would have to be deducted; 210 therefore would appear to be the true total, if the figures of the "General Summary" are correct.

appears that these 725 Societies held properties originally valued at £5,341,933 18s. 8d., on which advances amounting to £4,439,678 6s. 7d., or more than four-fifths of the value, had been made; that the aggregate amount of debts due when possession was taken was £4,312,312 5s. 9d., the amount included in assets in respect of the properties at the date of the account was £3,902,951 7s. 3d., and the gross income at the date of the account £303,866 9s. 9d., the gross outgoings being £169,993 18s. 5d., which, being deducted from the gross income, appears to give a nett income of £133,862 11s. 4d., or less than 3½ per cent. on the amount included in assets, and a mere trifle over 3 per cent. on the aggregate of debts due when possession was taken. The persistent refusal of the 211 societies to obey Parliament at least induces a suspicion that a less satisfactory state of things yet would be revealed in their case, and shows the need that exists for compelling them to bring the state of their affairs to the light. It may be remarked, as a singularity, that the net income yielded by properties in possession, reckoned on the amount included in assets, is highest in Ireland, amounting to over 4 per cent.; but there, too, some comparatively large societies have made no return.

J. M. LUDLOW.

MUNICIPAL FAMILY HOME AT GLASGOW.—It is now fully twenty years since the Corporation of Glasgow set the example of a municipality erecting “model lodging-houses.” Of these there are at present seven in that city, containing in all over two thousand beds. These have been so well managed that they have yielded a steady return, in some years paying nearly 5 per cent. on the original cost; they have, moreover, had the indirect result of raising the standard of the lodging-houses run by private enterprise, so that it is now considered there is fully adequate provision of this kind of accommodation in Glasgow.

But such lodging-houses are, of course, only for the migratory and “unencumbered” poor; they in no way meet the needs of small households, especially those in which there are children: hence, the Corporation is now planning a new departure to meet the needs of this class. A vacant piece of ground belonging to them on the north side of St. Andrew’s Street, close to the famous Salt Market, is to be used for the erection of a building as a “family home.” In this there are to be 176 “dormitories,” which will be let at an average rent of about four shillings each. In addition to these, which will be let to individuals or to families, there will be a common kitchen, playrooms for the children (under proper supervision), and common rooms for the older folk. Hence parents whose work takes them away

for the whole day will be able to feel that their children are cared for in their absence, and not allowed to run the streets, while they can have them at home in the evenings. It is calculated that the rents of these rooms will amount to some £2000 a year, which will cover the interest (at 5 per cent.) on the value of the site (£6000), and pay 3 per cent. besides on the cost of the building, which is estimated at £12,000 (exclusive of furnishing). This will leave an ample margin for the cost of management, which is placed at £1040. As the Glasgow people have done these things successfully before, they are likely to be able to realize their estimates. The scheme exists at present only on paper, but it is very likely to be adopted; and, if it succeeds, Glasgow will have made an important practical contribution to the question of the municipal housing of the poor—a question which may soon become a burning one.

J. WELLS.

LABOUR QUESTIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA.—During November and December of last year the Labour Commission continued its sittings in various centres in the country districts and at Kimberley. Unfortunately the proceedings in some places are not at all completely reported in the Capetown papers, and, either from this reason or from the nature of the inquiry under the reconstituted commission, it is difficult to add much to what I have already written. At Kimberley, especially, important evidence might have been expected. The first evidence taken there was from farmers, and was to the effect that the difficulty of obtaining labour was chiefly due to natives refusing to work, though to some extent also to the high wages given in the diamond mines, but less stress was laid on this than one would have expected. The country canteen was regarded as a great drawback. Locations for the natives under government inspection were advocated, and it was suggested that farmers should be compelled to hire labourers from the inspectors, who should know enough of the circumstances of the men under their charge to detect any stock-thefts. The location system diminishes drunkenness. Another suggestion was that a law should be made by which every person should be bound to prove to a proper authority that he has a means of livelihood. This would affect white as well as coloured persons, for poor whites exist in this as in other districts.

At the De Beers consolidated mines some eight hundred convicts are employed, all natives, by contract with the Government, who of course appoint their own officials. Besides these, about 2200 free native labourers are employed. Ordinary labourers in the mines are paid

4s. a day, other labourers 3s. or 3s. 6d., and skilled miners 5s. The shifts are of twelve hours. Surface labourers get 15s. a week ; there is not the same risk as in underground work. It is said that they like their surroundings ; they get their money regularly, and are protected from being knocked about by overseers. Discipline is enforced by fines of one or two days' pay for refusing to work or any similar offence. All these labourers are under contract for at least three months. They live in compounds, and are provided for by the company. I presume the cost is deducted from their wages, but on this point, as on others, the newspaper report is not explicit. So far is the evidence of the manager of the compounds. The utmost precautions are taken to prevent any diamonds being stolen, the compounds being guarded by sentries ; and these precautions are redoubled when any labourers are about to leave on the expiration of their contract. No intoxicating liquor is allowed in the compounds. Mention has been made of the dangers of the mines ; only a few days before the date of writing, a mud-rush occurred which caused the death of sixteen men, one of them an Englishman. These last facts I draw from other sources than the evidence before the Commission.

The secretary of the Diamond-fields Union, which consists of six hundred and fifty white men, gave evidence that there were three hundred white men out of employment in Kimberley and Beaconsfield. This was due to a system in existence in the mines of employing men for unlimited times—twenty-four and even thirty-six hours at a stretch. These men comprised engineers, blacksmiths, and carpenters. He said the whole district was stagnant for white labour, and advocated an eight-hours law.

To sum up, it appears that from a physical point of view the labourers in the diamond mines are well off, but the restrictions to which they are subjected, although entered into by their own consent, are scarcely likely to have an elevating effect on them. Can such a system be morally justified when the produce of it is, for the most part, a mere luxury ?

Little need be said on the evidence published from other places : in the main, it confirms what I have already given as the summary of former evidence. Testimony was borne to the admirable results of the industrial training provided by the Moravian Mission. One magistrate expressed an opinion that the enforcement of the lash for offences under the Masters and Servants Act would cause the resignation of many magistrates. The prohibition of the sale of liquor to natives, and the imposition of an excise on brandy were advocated.

Both these proposals are being supported by the Church Temperance

Society in the Province of South Africa ; and a pamphlet by Mr. J. T. Molteno, M.L.A., formerly a member of the Labour Commission, which suggests these and other similar measures, has received a sympathetic reception at the hands of members of the Legislative Council and Assembly, editors of newspapers, magistrates, and clergy. At the recent general election the liquor question was brought prominently forward in many cases, and in Capetown and the Cape Division all the members returned are pledged to support reform in this direction. The *Cape Times* has done good work in keeping the subject well before the notice of its readers.

A startling development in the treatment of natives has taken place at Johannesburg. It appears that ladies have been subjected to annoyance by natives thronging the footpaths in the town, and, in order to prevent this, a regulation has been made by the Sanitary Board (which answers to a municipal council), forbidding men to walk on the footpaths. No attempt was made to inform the natives of the new regulation, but on the first day after it came into operation forty-eight were arrested and sentenced to ten lashes each with a cat-o'-nine-tails. Next day seventy were similarly treated. In some cases the men were only crossing the pavement to enter shops or the places where they were employed, and in many cases they were quite ignorant that they were committing any offence. The *Standard and Diggers' News* give a minute account of the flogging, and gloats over every detail: if this is the kind of reading which delights the English portion of the citizens of Johannesburg, it shows how the commercial spirit of the place can degrade a people famed for their love of liberty and justice. The article concludes: "It was somewhat curious to stand by and watch this undoubtedly heavy punishment meted out to an entire crowd for the mere offence of walking on a footpath instead of in the middle of the road, and doubtless the Press of Exeter Hall (*sic*) would have some very considerable warmth of sentiment to vent upon it." As a direct consequence of such treatment many natives are leaving the town. They say "We are being murdered here for walking on the pavements, and why should we stay?" Whether as a result of this or not, I cannot say, but a serious disturbance is just reported from Johannesburg; five indunas incited the natives on the Langlaagte Estate Mine to break their contracts and return home. A thousand of them, armed with hatchets and knob-kerries, attempted to leave the compound, but, by the aid of mounted police with drawn swords, were disarmed, and one hundred and sixty arrested and sentenced, the ring-leaders to two months' hard labour, the rest to a fine of £2 each or fifteen lashes.

A recent meeting of the Johannesburg Mine Managers' Association has passed resolutions in favour of the immediate and entire suppression of the liquor traffic among natives. At this meeting it was stated that twenty-eight thousand natives are employed by the Rand mines, at average wages of fifty-eight shillings a month.

V. T. KIRBY.

AN ATTEMPT TO REGULATE SELLING PRICES.—Several years ago the manufacturers of steel articles made in the rough for the purpose of being sold to other manufacturers for sale agreed to form an association with the object of fixing a list of minimum selling prices, and varying these prices from time to time according to the votes of a majority of the members. A schedule of prices was agreed upon, and legal advice was taken as to the possibility of giving legal effect to the scheme. Their adviser informed them that any contract binding them to the proposed association would be void, on the ground of its being in restraint of trade. He also pointed out the following further difficulties :—

1. Fixing a penalty for breach of contract. The association wished to inflict a large penalty (£100) if any member sold for less than the agreed minimum any goods, however small the parcel might be, as it was felt that there might be great difficulty in obtaining legal proof of repeated sales below the minimum. The legal adviser pointed out that such a penalty, being quite beyond the damage sustained by the members of the association, would probably be unenforceable in the courts.

2. Finding a person to sue offending members. An official of the association would have to act as plaintiff in any action. He would be in an unenviable position, as he would become personally liable for the defendant's costs if the action were lost, and a wealthy defendant might carry the case through the Court of Appeal to the House of Lords. An indemnity to the official might be difficult to enforce ; and it might be difficult to secure, in the first instance, a sufficiently large amount of cash to pay costs on both sides if the action were ultimately unsuccessful.

3. Calling a defendant's clerks, etc., to prove against their master the real selling prices, discounts, etc. A party who calls a witness is assumed to offer him to the court as a truthful witness. He can therefore only *examine* his own witness, and must take the answers as true. He cannot *cross-examine* his own witnesses. Hence, if the suing official were to call the defendant's traveller, this witness could not be cross-examined in the interests of the association. The defendant

would be sure not to call a dangerous witness and submit him to the ordeal of cross-examination.

4. Providing for losses of the unemployed members of the association. It was thought that the association might be met by an opposing ring of buyers, whose policy would be to "boycott" for long periods some of the weaker members of the association, and thus inflict on these weaker members large losses, and fill them with suspicion that they were being undersold by the employed members of the association. These victims would have a claim to support, and ought to be kept (at least) out of bankruptcy.

After carefully considering these points, the scheme was abandoned.

THE EIGHT-HOURS DAY AT THE SALFORD IRONWORKS.¹—Before February 20, 1893, Mather and Platt's well-known engineering and machine-making works were running for fifty-three hours per week. Since then they have run for forty-eight hours only, and Mr. Mather's *Report* is intended to give the results of the change. The statistics which he furnishes, however, are vague, and not altogether satisfactory. Comparing the first year of the new system with the average of the preceding six years, he tells us, in the first place, that there was an increase of 0·4 per cent. in the ratio of wages to turnover. This seems to mean that the wages bill, which had been, let us say, x per cent. on the gross returns of the business in 1887–92, rose to $x + 0·4$ per cent. in 1893. So, for example, if the wages bill was equal to 60 per cent. of the gross returns in 1887–92 it must have risen to 60·4 per cent. in 1893, and not merely to 60 plus 0·4 per cent. of 60, i.e. 60·24 per cent. This statement by itself does not throw much light on the question at issue, which is, whether it will pay an employer to reduce his hours from fifty-three to forty-eight without altering wages. The ratio between the amount paid in wages and the gross returns must obviously depend, not only on the amount paid in wages per any given unit of produce, but also on the amount realized by the sale of that unit. Mr. Mather accordingly tells us that, as a matter of fact, selling prices were considerably lower in the trial year, and that if they had remained the same, "the wages cost, instead of showing an increase of 0·4 per cent., would have shown a decided decrease." It appears, then, that, provided the character of the products underwent no change,

¹ *Report on a Year's Work with a Forty-eight Hours Week in the Salford Ironworks, Manchester* (Mather and Platt, Ltd.). Addressed to the employers and workmen in the engineering and machine-making trades. By William Mather, M.P.
 † *Reply to some Criticisms*, by the same: reprinted from the *Times* of May 28, 1894. [8vo. 28 and 8 pp. 6d., post free. P. S. King and Son. London, 1894.]

the absolute (not proportionate) wages cost of a given unit of produce, such as of a boiler of a particular size, shape, and quality, must have been smaller in 1893 than before ; and if this was so, it is obvious that Mather and Platt must have been better off with regard to wages. But was the character of the products the same ? Mr. Mather merely says that " the character of the work turned out during the year of trial was similar to that of the preceding six years, viz. general engineering work, in which are comprised steam engines, pumping machinery, boiler work, etc. ; all machinery used in the textile trades (other than spinning and weaving) for the bleaching, printing, and finishing of cotton, linen, silk, and other fabrics ; electrical machinery of every variety, for lighting, transmission of power, electric traction, electro-depositing, electro-chemical processes, etc." It is clear that the wages cost must form a much smaller proportion of the selling price of some of these articles than it does in the case of others, and it might very easily have happened that Mather and Platt made more of the articles in the case of which the wages cost is low and less of the articles in the case of which the wages cost is higher in 1893 than in the preceding six years. Mr. Mather makes no statement on this subject, and consequently leaves the whole matter undecided.

Proceeding to consider the effects of the change upon expenses other than wages, Mr. Mather says " the question of savings in consumables on the one hand, and the greater load of fixed charges on the other, has been the subject of close investigation. We have found a marked economy in gas and electric lighting, wear and tear of machinery, engines, gearing, etc., fuel, and lubricants, and miscellaneous stores. On the other hand, we have examined the increased fixed charges due to interest of plant and machinery, rent and taxes, permanent staff on fixed salaries being employed five hours less per week." Now, why were these " fixed " charges " increased " instead of remaining fixed ? Had the permanent staff to be increased because it did not do as much in forty-eight hours as in fifty-three ? Were more plant, more machinery, and larger buildings used because more workmen had to be employed to produce the same output ? and, if not, how did the reduction of hours cause an increase in interest and rent and taxes ? These questions are left unsolved both in the *Report* and the *Reply*, although some of them were asked by correspondents of the *Times*. Mr. Mather merely gives us to understand that the nett saving on the two sets of expenses taken together amounts " to 0·4 per cent. on the nett amount of the year's turnover. Thus," he adds, " by a remarkable coincidence, a saving of 0·4 per cent. is secured as a direct consequence of the shorter hours, which counterbalances the debit of

0·4 per cent. in the increased wages cost." All that this "remarkable coincidence" really means is that the remaining expenses (cost of materials being probably the chief) *plus* the profits of the business bore the same proportion to the turnover, or nett amount of the turnover, which seems to be the same thing, in 1893 as in 1887-92. If we suppose the wages bill to have been 60 per cent. of the turnover in 1887-92, and the fuel, lubricants, etc., together with the "fixed" charges to have been 20 per cent., we get the following results :—

	1887-1892.	1893.
Wages	60	60·4
Fuel, etc., and fixed charges ..	20	19·6
Materials, etc., and profits ..	20	20
"Turnover"	100	100

How this can be supposed to prove anything it is difficult to see.

In a separate paragraph devoted to piecework, Mr. Mather admits that the piece-workers turned out slightly less work per man in the forty-eight hours than the fifty-three. "But," he says, "as the total output of the works during the trial year was greater than that of previous years, the diminution in the production of the piece-workers must have been more than compensated for by extra production on the part of the day-workers." This argument obviously implies that the number of persons employed was the same in 1893 as in 1887-92, and that the output per man was greater. Now, if Mr. Mather knows that the output per man was greater, it is extraordinary that he did not place the fact in the forefront instead of mentioning it casually as "a curious fact" which is "illustrated by the piece-workers' statistics." If the individual piece-worker's wages were reduced in proportion to the reduction of his output, and the individual day-worker's wages remained the same while his output rose, it surely needs no elaborate and fallacious comparisons of wages and turnover to show that Mather and Platt were gainers.

Doubt upon doubt intrudes itself as we read Mr. Mather's pamphlet. It seems that before the experiment was begun the works ran more than fifty-three hours per week, and that afterwards they ran more than forty-eight hours. Before the experiment overtime was sometimes worked ; afterwards a double shift was sometimes resorted to. Will it be believed that Mr. Mather gives us no information whatever about the length of this extra time, and the remuneration of the persons employed ? Incidentally he observes that work done by the second

shift "is not paid for at an abnormal rate;" that is to say, it costs less than overtime work. It seems, therefore, that a portion of the labour employed by Messrs. Mather and Platt was paid at a lower rate per hour in 1893 than in 1887-92, so that it is not the case even as regards time-workers that the men were paid exactly the same wages per day as before. Here, then, is a very important point entirely neglected by Mr. Mather.

However complete Mr. Mather's failure to prove his case by statistics may be, most people will probably be ready to accept his belief that the experiment has been a success. There is certainly nothing incredible or even astonishing in the proposition that a man can do as much in four and a quarter hours between breakfast and dinner, and four and a half between dinner and tea, as in two hours before breakfast, three and a half between breakfast and dinner, and four between dinner and tea. It is a question of working on a full stomach, rather than a question of short hours. The question of short *versus* long hours will only be raised in its purity when it is proposed to cut off the extra quarter and half hour and come down to a real eight hours day with a half holiday on Saturday. When that is granted by an enlightened successor of Mr. Mather, or wrung from an unenlightened successor, the next forward step will not be a further reduction of hours but the far more difficult one of diversification of employment. In those days, if all goes well, Mather and Platt will have two or three shifts, but each shift will only work four hours. When one shift is at the Salford Works, the other shifts will be driving tram cars, editing newspapers, or teaching school. Once a year every man will have a month in the country at agricultural labour. This may be Utopian, but it is certain that there are still many improvements in the womb of the future, and the correspondents of the *Times* whose feelings are hurt by Mr. Mather having let his twelve hundred men begin work after breakfast instead of before, may look forward to many cruel sufferings, compared with which their present pangs will seem as nothing.

EDWIN CANNAN.

LEGISLATION, PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES, AND OFFICIAL RETURNS.

THE Return of the several Circular Letters which have been issued by the Local Government Board to local authorities with reference to the provisions of the Local Government Act, 1894 (House of Commons Paper No. 119, fol., 38 pp., 4d., postage 1d.), gives more information than many of the popular compendiums of the act with regard to the methods to be followed in the settlement of areas and boundaries, which is by far the most important question of the moment in a very large proportion of districts and parishes. It confirms the statement made in these pages last April to the effect that under the act it will no longer, as at present, be the case that every "rural district" must be conterminous with the rural portion of a poor law union. The new complications which may be thus introduced have been very generally overlooked.

The Statistical Tables relating to Emigration and Immigration from and into the United Kingdom in 1893 (House of Commons Paper No. 90, fol., 53 pp., 5½d., postage 1½d.) shows a slight diminution of migration in both directions, and an infinitesimal decrease in the net emigration. The total inflow was 702,995, and the total outflow 609,696, which gives a balance of outflow amounting to 93,299 against 93,483 in 1892 and 96,732 in 1891. The number of European foreigners added to those already resident in the country is estimated at about 6500. It is rather surprising that the Report takes no notice of the Census, most of the results of which were published since the Report for 1892. We should naturally expect to find some attempt to show how far the Board of Trade's statistics of emigration and immigration are borne out by the census figures of natural and actual increase of population and of the numbers and distribution of foreign residents. Mr. Harvey Simmonds, the author of the Report, cannot have had the enumeration of foreign residents in his mind when he says the number of European "aliens in the country" increased by about 6500. The number of aliens in the country is obviously affected by death as by arrivals and departures, and at least two or three thousand aliens must die in the United Kingdom in each year. Like their predecessors,

the statistical tables divide all men into "British and Irish" on the one hand, and "Foreigners" on the other. Natives of British colonies seem to be included in "Foreigners," not in British and Irish, though no statement to this effect is made anywhere. This is clearly an improper use of the term "foreigner."

The *Return of Aliens naturalized between 1 August and 31 December, 1893* (House of Commons Paper No. 81, fol., 5 pp., 1d.), contains 152 names. Russia contributes 48, Germany 46, and France 12 to this total. No other country musters more than 8.

The *Report of the Registrar-General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in England for 1892* (Command Paper 7238, 8vo, 258 pp., 1s. 3d., postage 4½d.), probably owing to the pressure of work involved in bringing out the results of the census, is several months later than usual in making its appearance, and has been preceded by the *General Abstract of Marriages, Births, and Deaths* for the year 1893 (Command Paper, 7322, fol., 6 pp., 1d.). The *Report* begins as usual with what the Registrar calls his "estimate" of the population in the middle of the year. It has already been explained more than once in this *Review* that these estimates are not estimates in the ordinary sense of the word—that is to say, figures supposed to be right, but figures founded on an arbitrary assumption which is often positively known to be wrong. The high mortality of the winter of 1891–2 causes the fact to be brought into relief in the Registrar's stereotyped opening paragraph:—

"The population of England and Wales, as enumerated on the 6th April, 1891, consisted of 29,002,525 persons. The natural increase, or excess of births over deaths, from the beginning of April, 1891, to the middle of 1892, amounted to 392,720. This would bring the population at the latter date up to 29,395,245, supposing there to have been no migration. Emigration and immigration, however, cannot be disregarded in estimating a population. In the absence of precise information on these points, the estimated populations published in the *Annual Reports* are based on the assumption that the rate of increase which prevailed in the last intercensal period has since been maintained—a method which, as has been shown (see pp. v., vi., of *Fifty-third Annual Report*) is not likely to lead to serious error when so large an area as that of the entire country is dealt with.

"Thus estimated, the population in the middle of the year 1892 was 29,405,054." Because "emigration and immigration cannot be disregarded in estimating a population," then, the Registrar estimates the population at a number which implies that the immigration for the fifteen months must have exceeded the emigration by 9809, although in

the decade of 1881-1891, on which he relies, the emigration exceeded the immigration by 601,388, and although the Board of Trade returns just noticed make the net emigration from the United Kingdom amount to more than 90,000 in 1891 and 1892. It is astonishing that the statement that the official method is not likely to lead to serious error should be still persisted in. It will be remembered that the official estimate for 1891 was 701,843 in excess of the true number shown by the census, while Dr. Longstaff's estimate, based on the information which the Registrar rejects as insufficiently precise, was only 10,251 in excess. At present, there seems some probability that the official estimates for each year from 1892 to 1901—they are all to be found cut and dried in the *General Report of the Census*—will be even more erroneous than their predecessors for the years 1882 to 1891.

The number of marriages in 1892 showed a slight increase on the figures of the previous year, and was the highest on record, viz. 227,135. In 1893 the number fell again to 218,251. The proportion of the total in which widowers and widows were concerned rose slightly in 1892, after having steadily diminished for many years. The average age at marriage again increased, and the proportion of minors married diminished, as it has been doing ever since 1874. It is still, however, far above the level which prevailed in the first years for which the statistics are available. In 1844 the bridegrooms under 21 were 42 per thousand, and the brides under 21 were 132 per thousand of the total. By 1874 the proportion of bridegrooms under 21 had risen to 84, and the proportion of brides to 227. In 1892 the proportions had fallen to 59 and 187. Out of every thousand marriages in England and Wales, 698 were celebrated by the Church of England, 163 by other religious denominations, and 139 by registrars. The figures for Monmouthshire are in every thousand marriages, 487 Church, 247 Nonconformist, and 266 civil; in South Wales 324 Church, 268 Nonconformist, and 408 civil; and in North Wales 343 Church, 374 Nonconformist, and 283 civil. The numbers for Wales and Monmouthshire taken together are not given, but by a somewhat laborious arithmetical process they can be deduced from the proportions given in Table 6, and the aggregate of marriages in the three divisions stated on p. 3. They come out as follows: Church marriages 353 per thousand, Nonconformist 288, and civil 358.

The number of births was smaller in 1892 than in 1891, but in 1893 it was almost exactly equal to the number recorded in 1891. The deaths were lower in both years than in 1891. The excess of births over deaths has now risen for three years in succession from the very low level to which it dropped in 1890 in consequence of the first influenza visitation.

It is still considerably below any year since 1875. The average annual excess of births over deaths from 1876 to 1889 was 370,166, while for the next four years it was only 329,115. The following table will enable a comparison to be made between the last four and the preceding twelve years.

		Marriages.	Births.	Deaths.	Excess of Births over Deaths.
Four years, 1878-81	..	761,391	3,537,580	2,086,687	1,450,893
" 1882-85	..	812,835	3,580,756	2,093,229	1,487,527
" 1886-89	..	814,275	3,555,903	2,097,358	1,458,545
One year, 1890	..	223,028	869,937	562,248	307,689
" 1891	..	226,526	914,157	587,925	326,232
" 1892	..	227,135	897,957	559,684	338,273
" 1893	..	218,251	914,189	569,923	344,266
Four years, 1890-93	..	894,940	3,596,240	2,279,780	1,316,460

The influenza epidemics of 1890, 1891, and 1892 are supposed by the Registrar-General to be directly or indirectly responsible for the deaths of not less, and possibly considerably more, than 110,000 persons.

The publications of the Labour Commission for the quarter are as follows :—

The Agricultural Labourer—

Vol. iv., Ireland: part v., Indexes (Command Paper 6894—xxii., fol., 61 pp., 6d., postage, 2d.).

Indexes: vol. iii., Glossary of the technical terms used in the evidence (C. 7063—v. c., fol., 104 pp., 10d., postage 3d.).

Vol. iv.: Index to the evidence taken before the Commission sitting as a whole (C. 7063—iii., fol., 105 pp., 10½d., postage 3d.).

Foreign Reports—

Vol. viii., Italy (C. 7063—xii., fol., 100 pp., 11d., postage 3d.).

Vol. ix., Denmark, Sweden and Norway, Spain and Portugal (C. 7063—xiii., fol., 65 pp., 6½d., postage 2d.).

Vol. x., Russia (C. 7063—xiv., fol., 62 pp., 7½d., postage 2d.).

Vol. xi., Austria-Hungary and the States of the Balkan Peninsula (C. 7063—xv., fol., 225 pp., 2s. 11d., postage 4½d.).

Fifth and Final Report: Part i., The Report (C. 7421, fol., 254 pp., 2s., postage 4½d.). *Part ii., The Secretary's Report on the Work of the Office; Summaries of Evidence with Index and Appendices* (C. 7421—i., fol., 592 pp., 5s. 9d., postage 7½d.).

The last two volumes were not published till June 21st, too late to

admit of their being adequately treated here. But the forecasts and extracts which have appeared in the newspapers have been so confusing that it may be useful to give a short summary of the recommendations made by the various commissioners.

The majority report is signed by the Duke of Devonshire, Mr. David Dale, Sir M. Hicks-Beach, Messrs. A. J. Mundella, L. H. Courtney, J. Collings, Sir Frederick Pollock, Sir Edward Harland, Mr. W. T. Lewis, Professor Marshall, Messrs. G. W. Balfour, T. Burt, J. C. Bolton, A. Hewlett, T. H. Ismay, G. Livesey, S. Plimsoll, E. Trow, and W. Tunstill. It begins with six pages of introductory matter, in which, perhaps, the most interesting remark is that the commissioners are of opinion that the results of their work are of the highest value, and cannot be measured solely by the contents of their report. Then there follow eighty-eight pages containing a "General Review of the Evidence." The recommendations, which occupy the next seventeen pages, may be summed up as follows:—

1. (a) Special industrial tribunals for deciding questions arising upon existing agreements should not be systematically and generally established; but (b) town and county councils should be given power to take the initiative in the creation of special tribunals for defined districts or trades, more or less after the pattern of the French *Conseils de Prud'hommes*. Courts thus created "might be invested with powers of hearing, and (when unable to bring about an amicable settlement in court between the parties) deciding cases which might be brought before them, arising out of express or implied contract as between employers and employed within the area of their jurisdiction. These powers would be the same as those exercised in these cases by county courts or magistrates." (c) Powers of this kind should not be conferred upon the voluntary trade or district boards of conciliation which already exist.

2. The State should not establish district boards of conciliation and arbitration for the purpose of settling questions relating to future agreements (as opposed to questions arising on contracts already made) between employers and employed.

3. (a) The Board of Trade should be authorized "to take the initiative in aiding, by advice and local negotiations, the establishment of voluntary boards of conciliation and arbitration in any district or trade; and, further, to nominate, upon the application of employers and workmen interested, a conciliator or board of conciliation to act when any trade conflict may actually exist or be apprehended."

(b) The Board of Trade should be authorized, as is proposed in the Conciliation Bill now before Parliament, to inquire into the

circumstances of labour disputes, and to invite the parties to meet with a view to amicable settlement of the difference between them.

4. "A public department" should be given power "to appoint, upon the receipt of a sufficient application from the parties interested or from local boards of conciliation, a suitable person to act as arbitrator, either alone or in conjunction with local boards, or with assessors appointed by the employers and workmen concerned, according to the circumstances of each case."

5. (a) The various statistical and administrative functions connected with industrial matters which are now divided among several Government departments should not be concentrated and brought together under a single department, but the confusion and overlapping with regard to the sanitary regulation of workshops and factories should be remedied.

(b) At least part of the information published in the *Labour Gazette* should appear at more frequent intervals.

(c) The Labour Department and the *Labour Gazette* should be prepared to give advice and assistance to private associations or local authorities who intend to form, or have formed, labour registries.

(d) The Labour Department should be entrusted with the duty of forming a staff of skilled investigators, to take a proper industrial census and do much of the miscellaneous work now entrusted to temporary commissions and their assistants.

(e) The Labour Department should publish information as to the busy and slack times of seasonal trades, for the guidance of those private persons and public authorities "who are willing to go out of their way a little in order to confer a benefit, both material and moral, on the working classes."

(f) Public authorities, in more prosperous times, should prepare plans for works that are needed but not urgent, and hold them in readiness for times of depression.

(g) The Labour Department should publish information as to the action of public authorities "in inviting in suitable cases suitable contracts for the material needed, and for the work to be done on it, or for parts of that work, and especially in inviting associated bodies of working men to tender for the latter."

(h) A Higher Council of Labour, on the French or Belgian model, should not be established.

6. (a) A maximum working-day of a fixed number of hours should not be established by law with regard to mines.

(b) The powers of the Secretary of State to establish special rules

for the conduct of dangerous and unhealthy occupations should be expressly extended so as to include the regulation of hours in such industries. Regulations of the Secretary with regard to the hours of women and young persons "might" be final, "but when they directly relate to the hours of adult workmen they should be laid before both houses of Parliament before becoming law."

(c) Legal overtime, under the Factory and Workshop Act, 1878, sect. 53, should be reduced in the case of adults, and abolished in the case of young persons.

(d) The Factory and Workshop Acts should be extended to laundries.

7. Apprenticeship legislation should not be revived.

8. The Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act, 1875 (Picketing) should be amended by substituting "Uses or threatens to use violence to," for "Uses violence to or intimidates."

9. (a) All occupiers of workshops (excluding domestic workshops), and "perhaps" all occupiers of factories, in certain rather vaguely suggested trades or areas, should be compelled to take out a sanitary certificate.

(b) Penalties for breach of this regulation should be made recoverable from the immediate owner if they cannot be obtained from the occupier.

(c) All contractors and shopkeepers in the trades or areas dealt with should be compelled to keep lists of outworkers, and to take proper precautions that no work is done by them in uncertificated workshops.

10. (Seamen.) (a) Institutions like the Shipping Federation and the Seamen's Union should be licensed by the Board of Trade to supply seamen.

(b) The regulation space for each seaman on board ship should be increased from seventy-two to one hundred and twenty cubic feet in the case of new ships.

(c) Payment of allotted wages should be made fortnightly instead of monthly.

(d) Medicines put on board ships should be certified by the chemist who supplies them.

(e) Some qualification should be required from ships' cooks.

(f) Nominees of the Board of Trade on local marine boards should be as far as possible persons who are not shipowners.

11. (Agricultural Labour.) (a) Owners of all houses let at a rental of less than £10 a year should be obliged to make an annual return to the sanitary authority stating the number of persons in

each cottage, their sex and age, and also whether the house is in good sanitary and general condition.

(b) The medical officer of health should not be allowed to take private practice. He should be appointed by the County Council, and should not be removable without the consent of the Local Government Board. Where the expense would be too great for a single sanitary district, combinations should be resorted to.

(c) For the purpose of building cottages, State loans should be made to landowners in Great Britain at the lowest rate of interest which would secure the State from loss.

(d) The suggestions made by one of the assistant commissioners, Mr. O'Brien, for improving the procedure with regard to the building of cottages under the Labourers (Ireland) Acts should be considered.

Messrs. Lewis and Bolton add that they have signed the report "with the object of avoiding a separate report," though they are not in complete accord with some of the observations and suggestions. They do not say what are the observations and suggestions to which they object.

Mr. Livesey agrees generally with the report, and has, therefore, signed it, although there are some observations and suggestions with which he is not in complete accord. He does "not consider that the course pursued by the great majority of trades associations is calculated to promote industrial peace."

The Duke of Devonshire, Mr. Dale, Sir M. Hicks-Beach, Mr. Courtney, Sir Frederick Pollock, and Messrs. Ismay, Livesey, and Tunstill desire to call attention to some proposals "with regard to which there proved to be no such general agreement as would justify their inclusion in the body of the *Report*." Their recommendation is that trade associations, whether of employers or employed, "should have the liberty, if they desire it, of acquiring a larger legal personality and corporate character than that which they can at present possess." It should be made possible to hold an association responsible for the observance of agreements made by it, and power should be given to the association to recover damages from any of its members who infringed the collective agreement. This, it is thought, would be of great use in promoting and facilitating arbitration.

Mr. Jesse Collings recommends peasant proprietorship, certain measures with regard to agricultural labourers' cottages, and that the subject of old-age pensions "should engage the serious attention of Parliament with a view of finding some practical scheme which would, without the taint of pauperism, secure reasonable comforts to agricultural labourers in their old age."

Mr. Trow agrees with Mr. Jesse Collings.

Sir Frederick Pollock regrets that circumstances have prevented the commission from considering the question of Employers' Liability in a more full and definite manner, and thinks the existing law as to common employment anything but satisfactory. So far Messrs. Mundella and Burt agree with him. He also thinks that "any substantial simplification of the law, whether accepted as final or not, should be welcomed as an improvement," and that the importance of the question of contracting out was exaggerated in the public discussions on the late bill.

Messrs. Abraham, Austin, Mawdsley and Mann find themselves unable to join in the report of the majority. "The greater part of that report," they say, "is taken up, not with any statement of the ascertained facts of the relations between employers and employed, or of the conditions of labour, but with a summary of the arguments used by witnesses for and against particular proposals. So far as we can judge, this summary has been intelligently and impartially performed. But in the comparatively few cases in which any definite conclusion is expressed as to the facts themselves, these conclusions appear to us either inaccurate, or, at best, to present too favourable a view of the condition of the mass of the working population. On the great majority of the points brought before the Commission, the majority report makes no recommendations whatever, whilst the vague and scanty reforms which it suggests seem to us inadequate."

Admitting that "the average condition of the wage-earners has by the legislative and other reforms of the past sixty years been steadily improved," the minority consider "the amelioration has been only partial." "We believe," they say, "that an earnest and persistent attempt should now be made, in the light of experience and economic science, so to use the collective power and the collective wealth of the community as permanently to raise the standard of life of the whole wage-earning class, and especially of those sections which have remained outside the influence of previous reforms. Such a policy will, of course, require time. We have no faith in any one panacea of social reform. Much may be hoped, especially among the better-paid workmen, from the advance of trade-union organization, co-operation, and other forms of voluntary association. But for the elevation of the standard of life of the most necessitous sections of the wage-earners we are driven to look mainly to a wise extension of collective action. The social and economic progress of the workers depends, in our judgment, mainly upon the systematic development of democratic public activity in its three principal forms—the national or municipal

administration of such industries as can conveniently be managed socially, the regulation of private enterprise in industries not yet taken over by the community, and the public provision, through taxation of rent and similarly unearned incomes, of educational and other facilities necessary for the mental and moral development of all classes of the community." The recommendations made by this group of commissioners are very numerous and detailed. An attempt to summarize them is apt to give an impression of vagueness which is entirely absent from the original text. They are classified under eleven headings :—

1. *The Sweated Trades*.—"Home work" should be diminished and discouraged in various ways.

2. *Hours of Labour*.—An eight-hours day should be adopted at once by all Government establishments, whether imperial or local, and should be enforced by special legislation for mines and textile factories. It should be gradually introduced into other trades by a system of provisional orders.

3. *The Factory Department*.—The present Factory and Mines Departments of the Home Office, the Labour Department of the Board of Trade, and the Registry of Friendly Societies should be amalgamated, and eventually placed under a Cabinet Minister for Labour. The system of regulation and inspection should be improved and extended in certain directions.

4. *Seamen*.—A normal eight-hours day should be introduced by means of a compulsory manning scale. Lascars should not exceed a fixed proportion of the crew. The cubic space per man should be 120 cubic feet, the system of allotting wages should be amended, and certain further provisions as to the crew's food should be made. Seamen should have elected representatives on local marine boards.

5. *Women Workers*.—The number of women inspectors should be increased, and the employment of women in white lead manufacture should be prohibited.

6. *The Agricultural Labourers*.—Parish councils should be given power to build cottages. No "new individual landowners" should be created by legislation, but further facilities for hiring land should be given. An honourable pension from public funds, as recommended by Mr. Charles Booth, should be granted to all aged persons alike.

7. *Employers' Liability*.—Another attempt to pass the late bill should be made, and its principle should be applied to all persons in Government employment without waiting for legislation.

8. *The Unemployed*.—Public authorities should be more careful in giving out orders and executing works so as not to add to seasonal

fluctuations of employment. A London dock board should be formed. For the residuum labour colonies should be tried.

9. *Conditions of Public Employment.*—Government should be a model employer. “The minimum wages of any able-bodied adult man in public employment in London should, at any rate, not be less than 24s. a week. For adult women in London, the County Council minimum of 18s. a week might be adopted, though equal wages ought to be paid for equal work whether performed by man or woman. In other localities, where the cost of living is less, the minimum might vary accordingly, but we think that in no case should a lower rate than 21s. be paid to adult men. The minimum should be periodically reconsidered with a view to its being raised whenever practicable.” Contractors should be dispensed with as far as possible, and, when they are employed, they should be bound to pay union rates of wages.

10. *Conciliation and Arbitration.*—Arbitration should be based on an inquiry whether the existing conditions are consistent with efficient citizenship, and the Labour Department should be empowered to order compulsory inspections of accounts.

11. *The Trade Union Acts.*—The present legal status of trade-unions should on no account be altered in the way suggested by the Duke of Devonshire and his seven allies.

Sir John Gorst, dissenting from all the other commissioners, presents a report of his own. Its chief recommendation is that county councils should be entrusted with the duty of establishing local boards of industry with wide powers, and that a central board, like that of Massachusetts, should be formed by the Government to deal with wider questions.

This finishes the reports, and the remainder of the volume called *Fifth and Final Report, part i.*, is filled by a few memoranda of different commissioners and a sixty-page review of the results of the agricultural labourer inquiry by Mr. W. C. Little, the senior assistant commissioner, who had been unable to complete his more detailed report in time.

The Commission has published 14,873 folio pages, in 4 single-sheet reports and 61 blue books. The appearance of each one of the 65 separate publications has been duly chronicled in the *Economic Review* from October 1892 to July 1894.

EDWIN CANNAN.

REVIEWS.

THE AGED POOR IN ENGLAND AND WALES. By CHARLES BOOTH. [525 pp. 8vo. 8s. 6d. net. Macmillan. London, 1894.]

Mr. Booth has given us another instalment of his statistical labours. In the present volume he examines the condition of the aged poor in England and Wales, and gives, tentatively, some results based on a large collection of figures. It would be called in Germany a *Tendenzschrift*, and can hardly be studied without considering its bearings on some pressing problems of the day. When old-age pensions are "in the air," and accepted as a policy by a political party, any increase to our knowledge of the actual state of things is welcome. But it must be owned that Mr. Booth's figures are "caviare." The mass of them is bewildering, the point of view is constantly shifting, the reader is left at the end in a somewhat dazed condition, and with a general impression that the wood is lost in the trees. I do not propose to give an analysis or a criticism of the figures themselves, but merely to set out some of the conclusions from them which are of large general interest.

And first, as to the methods of administering poor relief, and their effect on the figures of old-age pauperism. The arguments on either side are probably familiar to our readers; it will be a surprise to them to learn that no conclusion practically can be drawn from the facts. Mr. Booth has scheduled unions according as they give out-door relief freely or carefully or withhold it altogether. The two extreme policies are about equal in their results: no policy at all is the worst state of things: it is from this point of view indifferent which of the two policies is adopted. "Whenever a policy is carefully considered and acted upon, then, whatever that policy may be, good results do certainly follow." It must be noticed, however, that the number of unions dealt with is small, that local circumstances are very important, *e.g.* the condition of trade, the character of an industry, the migration of labour, that in some unions a policy is of recent adoption;—all these considerations may comfort those whose pet theories seem at first sight to be disproved.

We notice, again, the very unequal distribution of the aged, and its effect on pauperism. Decreasing populations have a high average of

old people and of old-age paupers. The suburbs of towns are filled by young and vigorous populations and are comparatively free from old-age pauperism ; on the other hand, in purely country districts "it appears that the old people are actually best off where they are most numerous."

The reports on the condition of the aged in various districts of England contain an immense amount of information of rather unequal value. Tested by the district of which I happen to know something—the city of Oxford—they are not altogether trustworthy. It must make our Poor Law Guardian or charity organizer in Oxford rub his eyes to be told that the picture it presents is one of "intense gloom ;" to some of us, at any rate, when compared with the past the present is full of hope. It is not the case, to take definite statements, that the aged poor are separated in the workhouse ; on the contrary, the Guardians provide them with very comfortable quarters. It is not the case that the Charity Organization Society gives weekly allowances of one or two shillings—they know better than that. The account of the charities is meagre, if not misleading. The general effect produced is certainly not justified by the whole of the facts. It may be that Mr. Booth was exceptionally unfortunate in his Oxford correspondent, and it is to be hoped that the accounts from other districts are more trustworthy.

The accounts given of old people in villages are picturesque and full of pathetic interest. Those who wish to know what may be done in a country village by a high sense of responsibility, wise government, and hearty co-operation in well-doing are referred to the account of Singleton in Northants, which seems to be a modern paradise. There is no out-door pauper, only one regular indoor pauper and one "in and out." There are allotments, a system of main drainage, the cottagers all have pigs, milk is easily obtained, there is a co-operative steam-dairy, and the co-operators own the village public-house. Everywhere cottages are good, and accommodation sufficient. "O fortunati nimium !"

I conclude this notice with a few of the general conclusions which Mr. Booth draws.

"Comparing the present with the past it appears that :—

"1. The old share in the generally improved condition of the people, due to higher wages and lower prices.

"2. They are, however, comparatively at a disadvantage owing to the increased stress of industrial life.

"3. The improvement in industrial condition thus acts directly against, and only indirectly in favour of, the old."

L. R. PHELPS.

SOCIAL EVOLUTION. BY BENJAMIN KIDD. [348 pp. 8vo. 10s. nett. Macmillan. London, 1894.]

This book might be described as an "inverted Buckle;" the author of the *History of Civilization* ascribed all progress to intellectual causes; Mr. Kidd concludes that "the race would in fact appear to be growing more and more religious, the winning sections being those in which, *ceteris paribus*, this type of character is most fully developed" (p. 286). In fact, the aim of the book is to prove from the standpoint of modern evolutionary science that it is "righteousness" (in the widest sense of the word) "that exalteth a nation." When I add that it is clearly written, and closely argued, and that it has not a dull page in it, it will be evident that it is worth the reading by all those who have any care for literature which is more than ephemeral. But it is hardly necessary to commend Mr. Kidd's book in this way, for it is admitted to have been one of the successes of the season, and has been hailed with approval by all parties.

Before criticizing what appear to be weak points in the argument of the book, it may be well briefly to summarize this. In the opening chapter, Mr. Kidd gives a picture of the "outlook," which cannot be called cheerful reading, but which is none the less true on that account; he then proceeds to sketch the "conditions of human progress," the main one of which he takes to be, "that all the successful forms of life must multiply beyond the limits of comfortable existence" (p. 36). The next chapter leads us to the main point of the book: "There is no rational sanction for the conditions of human progress"—so far as the interests of the individual are concerned, they are all for the modification of the struggle for existence; neither in the past nor in the present have the great mass of mankind had *reason* to exert themselves to continue a development which finds them and leaves them miserable. Why, then, do they continue to exert themselves? The answer is given in chapters iv. and v.: the "Central Feature of Human History" is religion; it is this which by its "ultra-rational sanctions" compels the individual to sacrifice his own ease and comfort for the interests of the race. The unscientific neglect with which science has sometimes treated the universal phenomena of religion has been often set forth before, but never more forcibly than by Mr. Kidd: without accepting all his conclusions as to the part played by religion, his treatment of this point is excellent.

After this it must be confessed the interest of the book falls off. The two chapters on "Western Civilization" attempt to trace, in the history of Europe, the features of development which he has been previously describing; but the scale is too vast to produce any real impression.

In reading these chapters an uneasy consciousness asserts itself that the history of Europe, if treated in this general way, might be made with equal ease to prove exactly the opposite of Mr. Kidd's position. Then follows a chapter on modern Socialism, which Mr. Kidd contends is as "individualistic and as *anti-social* as individualism in its most advanced forms." "Socialism in reality aims at exploiting, in the interests of the existing generation of individuals, the humanitarian movement which is providing a developmental force operating largely in the interests of future generations. It would, in fact, exploit this movement, while it cuts off the springs of it" (p. 241). In the last chapter but one Mr. Kidd strengthens his position on the negative side, by proving that "evolution is not primarily intellectual;" and, in the concluding remarks of the last chapter, he deals, among other topics, especially with the relation between races more and less advanced in civilization, arriving at conclusions diametrically opposed to the alarmist views of Mr. Pearson in his *National Life and Character*.

Such is the argument of the book. I am bound to add at once, that it seems to me to break down at the most important point. Mr. Kidd assumes that because the condition of the mass of mankind can be proved by statistics both to have always been, and to be now, miserable, therefore it is necessary to suppose some "ultra-rational sanction" if we are to understand their continued striving to maintain and to improve it; he takes Professor Huxley's rhetoric about "a kindly comet" to sweep it all away (p. 71) as if it were sober fact. But surely we cannot prove all this by statistics; the upper and middle classes of London may number only 17·8 of the population, but it as little follows that the remaining 82·2 per cent. of the population are miserable, as that these favoured classes are really happy. Canning's "needy knife-grinder" undoubtedly belonged to General Booth's "submerged tenth;" but his cheerful happiness was far more characteristic of mankind in general than the bitter pessimism of the philosopher who kicked him and his wheel over.

In fact, mankind fortunately are blessed with the power of forgetting the past and the future in the present; if the latter is tolerable, the bitterness of the past and the hopelessness of the future count for little with most men. And even if they are profoundly miserable, the force of habit is a great conservative power; because they always have done a thing, men continue to do it. It is to these commonplace reasons, not to Mr. Kidd's "ultra-rational sanction," that society owes its continuance.

But I fear that I should quarrel with Mr. Kidd's thesis on even deeper grounds. Very little, if any, proof is given by him of his

assertion, that "every successful form must of necessity multiply beyond the limits which the average conditions of life comfortably provide for" (p. 37), is the law of human progress. And it might well be added that, even if our progress be due to this cause, it remains to be proved that it is a progress which is worth making. Mr. Kidd devotes considerable space to proving that we are intellectually the inferior of the race in past generations ; an equally strong case might be made out against our moral superiority. I do not say this would be right ; but our author ought not to assume, without attempting to prove it, that all progress due to the struggle for existence is necessarily in the right direction.

Turning now from the matter of the book to its form, it is a great pity that it is not shorter ; Mr. Kidd repeats his arguments, and even his illustrations, in a way that is wearying, and sometimes a little puzzling. And when the second edition appears (which it is to be hoped may be soon), it would be prudent for him to carefully revise his references to ancient, and especially to Roman, history. Though not exactly inaccurate, they appear in several instances to be put in a misleading way.

But it is ungracious to end with complaints of so original and so interesting a book. Mr. Kidd always gives his readers something to think about, even when they may not agree with him ; and it is comforting to read the words of cheerful confidence with which he ends : "There are many who speak of the new ruler of the nations as if he were the same idle Demos whose ears the dishonest courtiers have tickled from time immemorial. It is not so. Those who think he is about to bring chaos out of order, do not rightly apprehend the nature of his strength. They do not rightly perceive that his arrival is the crowning result of an ethical movement in which qualities and attributes which we have been all taught to regard as the very highest of which human nature is capable, find the completest expression they have ever reached in the history of the race."

J. WELLS.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH. By JOHN R. COMMONS, Professor of Economics, Indiana University. [258 pp. Crown 8vo. 7s. net. Macmillan. London, 1893.]

Professor Commons tries to show that, not the employer, or the capitalist, or the labourer, but the monopolist is the residual claimant of the product of industry. By an investigation full of subtle analysis, conducted in the most approved *a priori* method, he would convince us

that it is of small profit to toil or spin unassisted by natural or artificial monopolies ; and he seeks to prove that the result which he has reached deductively is in accordance with facts, by inserting a table, compiled by the *New York Tribune*, representing the sources whence 4047 American millionnaires have derived their wealth. Not that monopolies are altogether bad—far from it. On p. 83 they are called “the greatest economic invention the world has ever seen.” Most admirable of all forms of monopoly are the great trusts which, adapting supply to demand, will prevent crises and times of depression, and provide constant and regular work. Thanks to the greater wealth produced by this improved monopolistic organization, it will become possible to enforce the “right to employment,” which, like the right to life and liberty, depends upon economic progress and on increased production of wealth (apparently, “the right to life” in former ages justly yielded to the superior right of man to eat his neighbour when subsistence was scanty). “This right to employment, when enforced, would have the effect of guaranteeing to every worker, even the lowest, a share of the total income in excess of the minimum of subsistence. It would give steady work throughout the year, which would increase the wages of the labourer 30 to 50 per cent., and by overcoming the chronic excess of labourers beyond the opportunities for employment, *it would raise the marginal utility of the marginal labourers, thus raising the wages of all*” (!!).

But if monopolies are to usher in this golden age, it surely is rather hard that Professor Commons’s practical conclusion, stated in a few words on his last page, should be, “Tax reform ought to seek to remove all burdens from capital and labour, and impose them on monopolies. Public policy should leave capital, and labour, and business ability free and untrammelled, but endeavour to widen and enlarge the opportunities for their employment.” Not only land, and the legal privileges secured by railway or water companies, and the like, are to be taxed, but apparently also the goodwill of businesses, patents, copyrights, etc., for these also are classed by Mr. Commons as monopolies. Indeed it is difficult to see where the capitalist is to find the free and untaxed field for the employment of his capital which is promised to him : for our author regards capital with as much favour as any Ricardian. He deduces it from that familiar and respectable origin, the self-denial of the capitalist. “Abstinence is the true cost of the production of capital.” On p. 187 we have a diagram representing the gradual transition from pleasure to pain, with which the owner of a million dollars per annum effects his successive savings—no bad example, by the way, of the futile practice of attempting, by means of diagrams, to give

an appearance of quantitative accuracy to that which is incapable of measurement.

The cost of production of capital being the self-sacrifice or abstinence of the owners of capital, it is this cost of production which determines the rate of interest. Are we therefore to conclude that if interest is 3 per cent., abstinence involves only half the sacrifice it did when the market rate was 6 per cent.?

Although Mr. Commons admits that a great deal of capital is saved which represents no abstinence whatever, the consumption of which would bring only surfeit and disgust—he seems disposed to think that in all cases saving extends to a point “where sacrifice appears,” at which the rate of interest in “future pleasure is balanced against present pleasure postponed.” But this is questionable. People often have a standard of living they do not care to alter. This may be represented by £100 or £10,000 per annum, but any income above what they are accustomed to spend they save, whether the rate of interest be 1 or 10 per cent., or nothing, because they have no wish to spend.

Although in the main a follower of the Austrian economists, Professor Commons has given us in what he modestly calls his “Essay,” much that is original as well as interesting and suggestive. Yet we may be permitted to doubt whether the line which he tells us he “has attempted to cut through the tangled jungle and maze of the conflicting opinions” of previous economists is quite so straight and so clear as he supposes. The reader is sometimes perplexed by a vagueness of expression, due perhaps less to a careless use of language and obscurity of thought than to the pursuit of brevity, and is sometimes annoyed by dogmatic assertions which shock his prejudices, especially when they are unsupported by arguments convincing to his reason. So we are told, for instance, that “rent is a part of the cost of production of every article which society consumes.” Even if it were true, as Mr. Commons maintains, but as the British landowner would scarcely allow, that there is no land producing anything for which rent is not paid, this would not disprove the accepted theory, unless it could be shown that no part of the supply is produced by labour and capital which would not be employed on the land if additional rent had to be paid for the privilege of so using it. Like Mr. H. George, Professor Commons throughout treats the land question from the point of view of an American of the Western States.

It is difficult to turn over any page of this “essay” without finding some statement which is open to argument: but the errors of an

intelligent thinker may be suggestive and even instructive, and the student of Political Economy will find abundant material for thought in the 250 pages of this little book.

P. F. WILBERT.

EIGHT HOURS FOR WORK. By JOHN RAE, M.A. [xii., 340 pp. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. net. Macmillan. London, 1894.]

Eight Hours for Work, by the author of *Contemporary Socialism*, is a book that the statesman, the employer of labour, the intelligent artisan, and the student of economic science will severally do well to read. It is thoroughly business-like from the first page to the last. Every argument rests on a solid mass of evidence, and this evidence bears on its face the marks of having been carefully sifted and digested. The writer says in his preface that he was led to undertake his inquiry because he could find no solid bottom in any of the current prognostications, favourable or unfavourable, as to the probable consequences of a general adoption of an eight-hours working day. It seemed to him that they were all alike built on a little stock of assumptions about the natural effects of shorter hours, which nobody seemed to think it necessary to verify. Instead, therefore, of trusting to mere preconceptions of the natural effects of shorter hours, he set himself resolutely "to ascertain, if possible, what their actual effects have been in the countries which have had experience of them; to learn how the ten-hours day, and the nine-hours day, and especially the eight-hours day itself have worked out where they have been in actual operation." As it turned out, the available evidence was unexpectedly copious, and its teaching unexpectedly plain and uniform.

The lesson that he may read who runs however rapidly through the evidence collected by Mr. Rae is briefly this: that the man, and not the machine, however automatic, is the differential factor in efficient production, and that to wear out what Blanqui has called the *machine mère* by excessive hours is to destroy that human vigour which, rather than the steam, is what really makes the wheels go round. The average employer unfortunately still believes, if we may judge from the evidence given at the recent Labour Commission, that, because a machine, if properly worked, will turn out more in nine hours than in eight, therefore a day of nine hours will necessarily be more productive than one of eight hours. But such a view ignores the all-important qualification contained in the words "if properly worked." The question to be solved—the question which the present

essay goes so far to solve—is, “Can the average workman in the average trade work ‘properly,’ that is, with anything like the maximum of efficiency, in a day of nine hours?” Now, there can be no doubt that it actually pays better to work ten hours with fairly fresh men, than to work with utterly fagged men for twelve or even sixteen. That the reform introduced into the textile trades by the Ten Hours Act of 1847 was profitable, no less to employers than to employed, can be proved—and is proved in Mr. Rae’s book—by pages of irrefragable facts. But it does not follow, because it pays to drop from sixteen hours to ten, that it must pay to drop from ten to nine, or from nine to eight. Else why not at once propose a one-hour day, or one of five minutes with intervals for meals! Mr. Rae is careful not to render himself liable to this *reductio ad absurdum*, and is prepared to establish the efficiency of an eight-hours day neither more nor less by an appeal to facts. True, the facts in this case are not particularly numerous, as the idea of an eight-hours day—if we overlook the abortive eight-hours movement of Fielden in 1833—is a new one, as yet put into practice by but a few enlightened persons. We can scarcely argue at present, for instance, from Mr. Campbell Bannerman’s experiment in the public ordnance factories. Nevertheless, we may learn a good deal from the experiences of such large employers of labour as Messrs. S. H. Johnson and Co., of Stratford, London; Messrs. William Allan and Co., of Sunderland; Messrs. Short Brothers, of Sunderland; Messrs. Mather and Platt, of Salford; and Herr Freese, of Hamburg and Berlin. In particular, we have an excellent object-lesson presented to us by the colony of Victoria, where labour is so conspicuous for its energy and dash. On the other hand, there is next to no evidence to show that an eight-hours day has anywhere under any circumstances proved anything but financially successful; in fact, so little is there, that one does not feel at all sure that in eight hours we have reached the irreducible minimum of time beyond which it were ruin to attempt to go. Paradoxical, then, as it may seem to the *a priori* theorist, who can see in the mill-hand only the appendage and accident of the mill, it is made as clear as daylight by the facts themselves that good food and fresh air and reasonable leisure are the prime conditions of efficient production, and not the steam-engine, nor even that cupidity which the analytic economist of yesterday was wont to make the sole motive principle in the life of his “economic man.”

In making out his case for the eight-hours day, Mr. Rae quite rightly lays most stress on the reason which the facts most conspicuously attest, namely, that to shorten hours, even from nine to eight, is but

to "haul in slack," inasmuch as the "reserves of personal efficiency" that are thereby drawn upon are ample to compensate for the curtailed activity of the machinery. He advances only as subordinate grounds for the reform such considerations as that an eight-hours day is the only simple alternative to a twelve-hours day in such concerns as blast-furnaces or gas-works, where shifts are employed; or that it just means the dropping of the almost useless hour or so that precedes breakfast-time. The argument so often heard from the lips of the Hyde Park orator, that an eight-hours day is desirable because it would make room for the unemployed, our author absolutely condemns; as, indeed, he is bound to do, since such a view would be inconsistent with his main thesis, that by reason of its increased efficiency the present staff of each factory would under the new system be found able to maintain the output at the previous level. Again, he rightly waxes wroth with those working men who would, as unfortunately many of the labour-leaders would have them do, enter upon the eight-hours day with the wrong idea that they are to draw their benefit from a general reduction of their production, instead of with the idea that they are going to draw their benefit from doing their level best to maintain their production both in amount and quality. As he clearly shows, the necessary effect of restricting production must be to lower wages, not to raise them. Moreover, this would be simply to give away our trade to the foreigner, from whom, Mr. Rae thinks, we have nothing to fear so long as we diligently foster the cause of our present superiority, which consists in nothing else but the personal efficiency of our individual workmen.

As to the moral effects of the reform, our author, writing from the purely economic point of view, has nevertheless much to say, since it is germane to his argument to show that the leisure gained by the shortened day will not be spent to the detriment of health and strength in the public-house, but will, on the contrary, go to build up muscle and—even more important for the British artisan—brain. The mechanics' institute in winter and the garden allotment in summer are held by Mr. Rae—on the strength of not a little evidence, notably that afforded by Victoria—to be the resorts that will especially claim the extra hours of freedom; whilst, on the other hand, as he truly says, "the only resource of the languid is the tavern."

With regard to the means by which the reform is to be effected, our author speaks briefly and moderately, feeling, no doubt, that here he is leaving purely economic ground and that domain of fact where he seems to be so much at home. On the whole, he seems to be in favour of some principle of trade-option being introduced into the

Bill, if Parliament has to take the matter up. And that Parliament will have to do so, seems evident from the fact that employers of labour have hitherto shown so slight a disposition to concede an eight-hours day of their own accord ; though better might be expected from men of the world, whose particular failing is not usually that they are careless of their own interests. Perhaps, after reading Mr. Rae's book, they will awaken to the *rationale* of the reform, and anticipate the action of the otherwise inevitable Bill !

R. MARETT.

LONDON STATISTICS, 1892-3 : Returns printed by the London County Council during the year 1892-3, with a Summary of Statistics relating to London printed in the Annual Reports of Vestries and District Boards for the year 1891-2, and in Parliamentary Papers of the year 1892. [xliii., 706 pp. Fol. 5s. Steel and Jones. London, 1894.]

He who first cried, "O that mine enemy would write a book !" was a wise man, and a man of research. Those who can discern no merit in the London County Council are not wise, and are not addicted to research. Instead of reading the Council's annual volume, and finding out what its work actually is, they prefer to abuse it for going outside its province when it is performing duties entrusted to it by Parliament, and to complain that it is neglecting its proper business when it is simply not attempting to usurp the functions of other authorities.

Intelligent criticism might find a good deal to quarrel with in the Introductory Memorandum. Very unsuccessful, for example, is the ill-judged attempt to explain away the diminution in the rate of growth of the population of London which took place in the decade 1881-90, as compared with previous periods. It is admitted that in Registration London, which is the county of London without Penge, "until 1891 [misprint for 1881] the population grew in every ten years at a rate varying between 16 per cent. and 21 per cent., but that in the decade of 1881-91 this [sic] rate of increase fell to 10 per cent." Against this, however, is set the fact that the rate of increase in the ring of country between Registration London and the Metropolitan Police boundary only fell from 50·8 in 1861-70 and 50·5 in 1871-80 to 49·5 per cent. in 1881-90 ; and "thus it appears" to the statisticians of the Council "that the diminution in the rate of increase in inner London hardly holds good in the neighbouring area, and that therefore it cannot be taken to be a sign of any general falling off in the population." But how the fact that one part of a whole has only

decreased a little can prove that the whole has not decreased, although the part which has not decreased a little has decreased a great deal, it is difficult to see, and is indeed incompatible with the spirit of an axiom of Euclid. As a matter of fact, the rate of increase of population in the whole area inside the Metropolitan Police boundary was 20·5 per cent. in 1861–70, 22·6 in 1871–80, and only 18·1 in 1881–90. Forgetting, or at any rate omitting, to mention this circumstance, the statisticians endeavour to explain away the slight diminution of the rate of increase in the outer ring by suggesting that it is counterbalanced by more rapid increase outside the outer ring. “As people have moved from inner London to outer London, so they are now moving from greater London into the country districts of the home counties.” The Registrar-General said something to the same effect in the Preliminary and General Reports of the Census, but neither he nor the County Council have produced any statistics to prove their case. In order to supply their omission, I have added together the population of Surrey and Hertfordshire, and the registration districts of Dartford, Bromley, Gravesend, Sevenoaks, Maidstone, and Tunbridge in Kent, and Orsett, Billericay, Romford, Ongar, and Epping in Essex, omitting all such portions of the counties and districts as are within the Metropolitan Police boundary. The sum is 476,611 in 1861, 542,386 in 1871, 603,159 in 1881, and 688,573 in 1891. There is a considerable acceleration of the rate of increase, but the population involved is so small compared with that of the police district that its inclusion would have no perceptible effect in reducing the decrease in the rate of growth. It would make the increase in 1861–70 19·7 per cent., in 1871–80 21·2, and in 1881–90 17·7. The decrease in the rate of growth may very possibly be only a temporary one, but to deny its existence is useless. Yet the memorandum alleges that “it may fairly be said that there are no signs to justify a conclusion that the population of London and its neighbourhood is tending to do otherwise than increase at much the same rate as hitherto.” Proceeding to estimate the probable population of London in 1941, the memorandum suggests four different methods. The first, which brings out a population of 17,527,645, is to suppose that Registration London will go on steadily increasing at 10·3 per cent., and the outer ring at 49·5 per cent., in each decade. This is most fallacious, as it assumes that migration into outer London could go on increasing in geometrical ratio without depleting either inner London or the rest of England. Where are these millions and millions of immigrants to come from? The next method, which brings out a population of 14,312,007, is to “take the growth of greater London as a whole at the mean rate of

increase during the three decades of 1861-91." The plan of including the decades 1861-70 and 1871-80 makes the result about 1,300,000 greater than it would be if calculated from the rate observed in 1881-90 alone; and even a population of 13,000,000 could only be attained if the net immigration from the remainder of England went on increasing in geometrical ratio, which, from the nature of the case, is a most highly improbable event. Much more reasonable is the third estimate of 10,836,989, which is obtained by supposing that "London will only grow at the rate of the natural increase of births over deaths," since, even if the absolute amount of net immigration should remain the same, its proportionate amount will certainly diminish, and this will tend to reduce the rate of natural increase. The fourth estimate, 9,966,687, obtained by merely adding in each decade the number which has been added in 1881-90, is dismissed as clearly too low. I doubt, however, whether it is so. The growth in 1881-90 was 867,147 against 881,020 in 1871-80, and it is quite possible that the decennial increments may remain about this figure, since the birth-rate seems to be diminishing all over Western Europe, and the gain by migration in London and other English towns, as I have shown in this *Review* for October, 1893, and more in detail in the *National Review* for January, 1894, is diminishing.

Another part of the memorandum to which objection must be taken is § 8, which contains what purports to be an estimate of London's contribution to imperial taxation. Here the amount of income-tax paid in London is coolly set down as London's contribution to that tax, regardless of the fact that a large portion of the amount paid in London, *e.g.* the Lancashire profits of the North Western Railway paid to Yorkshire shareholders, and the profits of the Oxford Tramway Company paid to Oxford shareholders, has nothing whatever to do with London. In these days of world-wide enterprises and dual places of residence to attempt to apportion the income-tax locally is to follow the veriest will-of-the-wisp. Let the County Council try to apportion it between the City and the rest of London, and see what ludicrous results they will arrive at. With regard to stamps and excise the memorandum admits that no local apportionment is possible, and then solemnly proceeds to divide each item between London and the rest of England on the assumption that the payment per head is the same, which, of course, is a mere arithmetical exercise. Customs are omitted altogether, though it is not clear why they are not apportioned in the same way as excise and stamps. The whole calculation is absolutely valueless, and it is just as well for London that it is so, since if it were to be trusted, it would show that London possesses 41·97 of the taxable

income (income of persons with more than £150 a year) and pays less than 24 per cent. of the taxes !

Coming now to the body of the volume, we find the first 168 pages occupied by the ordinary accounts of the Council. The income of the Council and the expenditure for which it is directly responsible are very small, only about two and a quarter millions ; and of this total some £900,000 is swallowed up by interest and sinking fund of debt incurred before the Council was created. How much each of the bodies who spend the London ratepayer's money take from him, and how they spend it, is shown in an excellent return, which occupies pp. 463-603. The ratepayer has only to look out his parish, and he will find stated, in pounds, shillings, and pence, how much is spent per each £100 of ratable value by the County Council, the School Board, the Police, the Vestry, the Guardians, and the half a dozen other authorities under whom he lives. While this is shown in a column at the one side of the page, across it stretch other columns showing to what purposes the amount levied by each authority is put. It is difficult to imagine any set of statistics more likely to conduce to sound and economical administration than one which so facilitates comparison between different localities. From a return given on p. 262 it appears that the rates in suburban parishes outside the London county boundary are generally higher than inside.

The statistics appended to Mr. Llewellyn Smith's report on Technical Education fill a hundred pages, and the remainder of the volume deals with asylums, reformatory and industrial schools, improvements, Thames pollutions, markets, and every other thing under the London sun. The whole bears testimony to the energy and ability of the Council and its officers.

EDWIN CANNAN.

THE RISE OF MODERN DEMOCRACY IN OLD AND NEW ENGLAND. By CHARLES BORGEAUD. Translated by Mrs. BIRKBECK HILL. [xvi., 168 pp. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. Sonnenschein. London, 1894.]

This little book, one of the latest additions to the well-known "Social Science Series," merits a cordial welcome. The two essays which it contains treat of a fascinating, if difficult, period of our constitutional history, and thoroughly deserve to be placed in a convenient form before English readers. M. Borgeaud has been lucky in his translator ; for Mrs. Hill has done her work so carefully that, in its present shape, the volume reads almost as though it had been originally written in English. Moreover, the essays in question have

the advantage of being prefaced by an admirable introduction from the pen of Mr. C. H. Firth, which, needless to say, is full of valuable comments, as might be expected from one who is an acknowledged authority on all that appertains to the seventeenth century. At first sight it may seem anomalous that what is apparently a "dry" constitutional thesis should be included in a series professing to give information on the vital problems of the hour; but, as Mr. Firth rightly points out, M. Borgeaud's tractate is only in form historical: the writer's aim throughout has been "to study the making of constitutions." He deals with English institutions, not as the constitutional historian bent on setting forth in strict chronological sequence the genius and development of a political structure, but, rather as the philosophical analyst who is concerned with the origin, growth, and influence of dominant political ideas. Like the writings of another distinguished foreigner, M. Boutmy, this monograph is primarily a contribution to the history of thought. The value of such analyses would not be seriously questioned by any one. The pessimists amongst us are always ready to assert that the democracy of to-day is something *sui generis*—betraying an attitude of mind which has broken all connection with the past, and which, looking forward rather than back, makes the latter part of the nineteenth century a fatal and glaring breach of continuity. We need writers like M. Borgeaud to remind us how exaggerated such a charge is. By faithfully applying the historical method, by digging in the fertile soil of musty records, he shows how invariably we find the roots of the present in the past, and by laboriously emphasizing the points in common between the democratic programmes of the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, he has done good service both to history and politics.

M. Borgeaud's task has been to throw light on the sources of modern democracy. He has succeeded in proving the close connection that exists between the constructive efforts of seventeenth-century politicians and the actual institutions of to-day; and he has given us a searching analysis and careful exposition of the fundamental conceptions which form the basis of both. The student of Hobbes and the school of thought which he founded, the lover of the dry bones of constitutional history, the plain citizen of to-day who is neither of these, will find in these pages much that is new, and much, though not new, that is very suggestive. In itself the book is composed of two essays: the first occupied with a *résumé* of the creeds of the political democrats who formed the real backbone of the Parliamentary party in its struggle with Charles I.; the second, a dissection of the democratic constitutions of three of the New

England colonies—Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island. As Mr. Firth points out, the chief value of M. Borgeaud's studies lies in his examination of the "Agreement of the People," a document not touched on by Hallam, but which formed the groundwork of the "Instrument of Government" of 1653. By laying bare the real import of the ideas of which this "agreement" was the concrete expression, M. Borgeaud has shown clearly and succinctly how the modern conception of democracy as a system of government originates in the political and religious upheaval which we call the Reformation, how the new ideals in politics and religion became crystallized into the complex programme of Independency, and how the new movement failed to establish itself definitely in England, but crossed the seas and left ineffaceable traces of itself in the remarkable constitutions of the three colonies already mentioned. The "Agreement of the People"—the futile charter of a few political visionaries—is rightly singled out as logically, if not historically, the nidus out of which modern democracy has sprung. Criticism of M. Borgeaud's lucid pamphlet is not necessary. Mr. Firth sums up all that need be said when he speaks of "the extent of the author's researches, the accuracy of his knowledge, and the sobriety of his judgment." It only remains to recommend heartily this little volume to every English reader.

C. G. ROBERTSON.

THE TYRANNY OF SOCIALISM. By YVES GUYOT, Ex-Minister of Public Works of France. Edited, with an Introduction, by J. H. LEVY. [xl., 264 pp. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. Sonnenschein. London, 1894.]

It is rarely that the publishers of the "Social Science Series" make the mistake of putting their *imprimatur* on a work that in its whole conception is unscientific, and even professedly so. Matter in the wrong place is rubbish, and so is M. Yves Guyot's election manifesto against the Socialists, if—but only if—we are bound to regard it from the severe standpoint of economic science. No doubt it is an excellent *brochure de combat* in its way, and very amusing, even when translated into our cold English. But ephemeral manifesto it is, though it divide itself proudly into chapters and even books (one book extending over nine pages!). Thus, in one place, we are admitted into the Chamber to listen to M. Yves Guyot's witty replies to Socialist deputies, and after each reply "[Laughter]" is duly inserted. In another place we are obliged to assist at a dialogue between a "Determinist" and a delegate of the *Bourse du Travail*, which proceeds as follows:—

"*Delegate.* You are retrograde ; for you are not a Socialist !

"*Determinist*. Let us see. What do you understand by that word 'Socialist' ?

"*Del.* What! What do I understand by it? That is simple enough. A man is either a Socialist, or he is not; but you are not one."

Or again :—

"*Det.* Tell me what you think of the Government.

"*Del.* Nothing good! A pack of bourgeois, exploiters, and ignoramuses.

"*Det.* Oh!

"*Del.* Yes; Allemane, Brousse, Vaillant, and others, have told us so. And, in addition, they are a lot of Panama thieves.

"*Det.* Not all of them!

"*Del.* All!"

Out of this *olla podrida* it may indeed be worth the trouble to pick out the occasional good things in the way of epigrams. But science is "organized common sense;" and, whatever common sense M. Guyot's views may embody, there is assuredly no organized and systematic presentation of it to be met with in his impassioned denunciations of the "Reactionaries" of the extreme Left.

R. MARETT.

THE PARISH COUNCILS ACT EXPLAINED: What it will do and what it will not do. By J. THEODORE DODD, M.A.

I. FIRST OR SMALL EDITION. [116 pp. Crown 8vo. 1s. 6d. Cox. London, 1894.]

This work seems to fall between two stools. It is longer than the Act itself, and yet it does not give all the provisions of the Act. It thus possesses neither brevity nor completeness. The question of areas and boundaries, which occupies five pages in the Act, and needs in addition a good deal of elucidation by way of reference to earlier statutes, it dismisses in a single page. Any one who lives in a village which is divided between two existing parishes, the head places of which are each several miles away, need not turn to Mr. Dodd for information as to how a separate meeting or council may be obtained for the whole village. Most of the Act is so clear that explanation seems unnecessary, but it is possible that there are people who like to be told that they "are not bound to" do something which the Act says they "may" do (p. 73). On one important point, the relation of the board of guardians to the district council, the Act is somewhat reticent, and here a few plain words of exposition would certainly have been acceptable. But on this subject Mr. Dodd simply darkens counsel. He tells

us, on p. 5, that boards of guardians are among the bodies which will disappear in purely rural districts, and that district councils will in effect have their powers. On p. 6, he says that "(apparently) in all urban districts the board of guardians will continue to exist as a distinct body;" and, on p. 75, he says, "Where a poor-law area is conterminous with a rural district, the board of guardians will practically become the rural district council; but when the poor-law area is partly 'rural' and partly 'urban' the board of guardians will still exist separately, and comprise the persons termed district councillors (practically guardians) of the rural district and the guardians of the urban portion. This appears to be the effect of sect. 24." A footnote to "board of guardians" adds, "*Seem*, persons co-opted for poor-law purposes will not be district councillors." No unsophisticated reader would gather from this that the Act here simply continues existing arrangements. At present the guardians who represent urban constituencies are guardians and nothing more, while guardians who represent rural constituencies are also members of the sanitary authority of the rural district. Under the Act this will still be the case; the urban guardians (and all co-opted guardians) will be nothing but guardians, while the rural guardians will be both guardians and members of the rural district council, which is the old rural sanitary authority with a new name and somewhat enlarged powers. Mr. Dodd's "apparently," "appears," and "*seem*," are otiose, and his statement that in purely rural unions the boards of guardians will "disappear" or "practically become the rural district council" is quite wrong. The board of guardians and the district council, though, where a union and a rural district are conterminous, they will consist, with the exception of the co-opted guardians, of the same persons, will be quite distinct bodies—much more distinct than the existing board of guardians and rural sanitary authority. The time-table on p. 91 would be handy if the dates and references were all correct, but for "November 12th" we must read "1st," and two of the references are wrong.

II. LARGER EDITION. [324 pp. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. Cox. London, 1894.]

Mr. Dodd's larger edition, which arrived after the foregoing notice had been set up in type, contains the full text of the Act itself, and also of the Allotments Acts 1887 and 1890, the Public Improvement Act 1860, and the Commons Act 1893, as well as extracts from many other Acts, and large portions of the Local Government Board's circulars referred to on p. 406 of this *Review*. These additions, which supply the more serious of the omissions of the small edition, account

for 136 of the new pages. Of the other seventy nearly half deal with charities and allotments, and the remainder are devoted to minor improvements scattered through the book. More than thirty pages might have been saved by omitting the lengthy extracts from the Act, which are necessary in the small edition, but are superfluous and embarrassing to the reader in an edition which contains the whole Act at the end. The presence of these extracts is doubtless due merely to typographical exigencies, the larger edition being in great part a reprint of the smaller. The mistakes in the time-table noted above have been amended, but the confusion between the guardians and district councils reappears throughout. It seems to have an historical explanation. Just as the large edition of the *Parish Councils Act explained* is in part a reprint of the smaller edition, so the smaller edition is in part a reprint of the *Parish Councils Bill explained*. The meaning of the Bill was, perhaps, not so plain as that of the Act.

EDWIN CANNAN.

LE CAPITAL, LA SPÉCULATION, ET LA FINANCE AU XIX^e SIÈCLE. PAR CLAUDIO JANNET, Professeur d'Économie Politique à l'Institut Catholique de Paris. [607 pp. 8vo. Plon. Paris, 1892.]

It will, alas ! come as a surprise to many English readers, that the Western Church has in her treasury a system of moral theology capable of so conservative a development, and yet so wide an application and modification as may be seen in M. Jannet's treatise. The recent volume of Professor Ashley's *Economic History* will, it may be hoped, tend to stimulate inquiry in this direction. We need to be reminded, as M. Jannet reminds his readers, that even the greatest changes in historical circumstances seldom demand so profound a change in the expression of a principle as at first sight might seem necessary.

In an article contributed to the first number of this *Review*, and more recently in a work entitled *The Use and Abuse of Wealth* (which has come under M. Jannet's notice), the Rev. Dr. Cunningham indicated the urgent necessity of an investigation into the "Ethics of Investment." This need daily increases in importance as the progress of industry tends towards the elimination of the personal element. "Things are in the saddle, and ride mankind." "Un fort enseignement moral sur les conditions d'acquisition de la richesse, et sur son usage," writes M. Jannet, "est d'autant plus nécessaire que les formes modernes de la richesse, valeurs mobilières, sociétés anonymes, crédits en banque, ne placent pas leurs possesseurs sous les yeux et le contrôle de leurs concitoyens, comme la propriété de la terre et l'exercice des

industries manufacturières. Les habitudes cosmopolites, que les hautes classes tendent à prendre, facilitent singulièrement l'immoralité dans l'acquisition de la richesse et l'égoïsme dans son usage. On échappe par un *déplacement* aux légitimes censures du voisinage" (p. 543).

The volume before us is to a great extent a reply to those whose sole view as to the ethics of investment might be adequately expressed by Mr. Punch's classical advice to those about to marry—"Don't." The answer to this comprehensive proposal, M. Jannet, finds in a minute description of modern financial institutions. "La question débattue en ce livre est précisément de savoir quelle est l'importance relative dans l'état actuel des sociétés des richesses légitimement acquises et des richesses malhonnêtes. Cela nous amènera à discuter ce qui est légitime ou non dans certains phénomènes économiques contemporains, particulièrement dans les spéculations qui se produisent sur les marchés et sur les bourses" (p. 9). The nett result of this inquiry is in the favour of existing institutions, while at the same time their constant abuse is recorded and condemned. Of the portions of the book strictly relevant to this issue I have little to say but in commendation. M. Jannet draws his facts and figures from unimpeachable sources, and with the majority of them English students will be familiar. The subject undoubtedly offers serious difficulties to anything approaching a lucid statement, yet our author is to be congratulated on having completely overcome all such obstacles; and if M. Jannet should ever find a competent translator there is no doubt that Englishmen would accept his work as an indispensable counterpart to the late Walter Bagehot's *Lombard Street*. If I may be allowed to particularize any portion as especially worthy of notice, it would be the chapter in which the *Sociétés Anonymes* are described and discussed. In this chapter will be found a great deal of information which will be new to the English student, and which, if not, perhaps, altogether original, will hardly be found so adequately and so clearly expressed elsewhere.

But when we turn from M. Jannet's financial analysis to the conclusions this great mass of facts and figures is adduced to support, our confidence is somewhat severely shaken. It is quite fair to say that the work is a defence, not of riches, but of riches unequally distributed. In his opening sentence, M. Jannet lays it down that "l'inégalité des conditions est un loi de l'humanité." Inequality, he tells us, is, in the social sphere, the expression of the differentiation of functions. These ideas, of course, profoundly influence the whole attitude of the book. Despite his invocation of Catholic principles, M. Jannet, in the main, accepts the position of the "pure economist,"

and we have here but another "Plea for Liberty." It would, of course, be impossible to discuss the doctrine of industrial equality in this place, but I would venture to suggest that such a statement as the one quoted above involves a twofold danger: (1) the ascription to social or industrial inequality of the nature of a "law" is surely tantamount to an acceptance of those quasi-evolutionary theories of social life which have been so eloquently condemned by the great naturalist, Professor Huxley; (2) the assertion of such a principle must shut out from our eyes that wider vista opened up to political economy by the recognition that the problem before us is one of distribution rather than of production.

It would, indeed, seem evident that M. Jannet has not given sufficient attention to what may be called the distributive view of political economy. We find him gravely contrasting the productivist theories of Karl Marx with actual facts, and overlooking a yet more salient fact—that every educated Socialist, who is not a mere visionary, has discarded the jargon of "exploitation," "fleecing of capitalists," and "iron laws." It would seem that to M. Jannet economic theory is much the same as it was before Jevons and Böhm-Bawerk. This last omission in M. Jannet's argument deserves, however, something more than a mere record. Like our author, Böhm-Bawerk aimed at the destruction of the socialist theory of capital, and, in order to achieve this end, he had, also like our author, to demonstrate the serviceableness of capital. This he attempted to achieve in the volume recently translated into English under the title of *The Positive Theory of Capital*, but with what success I cannot in this place profess to judge. The negative results of the Austrian economist's work were, however, almost unequalled in the history of political economy, and it is surprising to find them so completely ignored by the author of a new work on capital and finance at the end of the nineteenth century. As I have said, M. Jannet deals with practice rather than theory, and this may to some extent account for what would otherwise have constituted a very grave omission in his treatment of the subject; yet it must be remembered that Böhm-Bawerk's criticism of the productivist theories of capital would also apply to the economic postulates of M. Jannet's argument.

Our author's attitude to the ideal of social equality is, perhaps, not an unnatural one on the part of a Roman Catholic writer, who feels that, as far as his own labours are concerned, the investigation of social problems must run along the lines laid down or even hinted in the encyclicals of Leo XIII. Thus we find that M. Jannet does not stand alone. It is interesting to note how many of the authorities whose opinions or whose authority he cites

are members of the Society of Jesus. Bearing in mind the main object of the book, the greatest importance would naturally be attached to chapter vi., which is entitled "La Morale dans le Commerce et l'Industrie;" and here the writer has followed and elaborately illustrated the principles of the well-known *Opus Theologicum Morale* compiled by the Jesuit Fathers Ballerini and Palmieri, and published at Prato in 1890. In the *Manual of Political Economy* recently added to the Jesuit "Stoneyhurst Series"—a series of manuals of philosophy which have received an express approval from the present Pope—there is a whole chapter consigned to an "Apology for the Rich."

It would seem, however, that M. Jannet has exceeded his traditions. I do not believe that he would be able to find any justification in ecclesiastical authority for his idea of inequality. St. Thomas Aquinas has, indeed, laid down the principle *nomen ordinis inaequalitatem importat*, yet the proposition cannot be converted simply; inequality does not involve order. M. Jannet can only justify the *status quo* by proving to demonstration that our present state of society is based on an order that gives every man his due, and in so doing establishes an order which in reality possesses no inequality, since every one starts with opportunities for securing his due. If the use of Comte's mathematical phraseology is still permissible, the matter might be clenched by saying that M. Jannet has, indeed, demonstrated the futility of a *material* ideal of statical equality, while he has entirely overlooked the *moral* ideal of dynamic equality.

In a passage quoted above, M. Jannet laments the existence of "la richesse irresponsable." The cure he would offer lies, to adopt some words lately used by Mr. Gladstone in relation to a very different matter, "more in improved tempers and conceptions in the individual than in projected and formulated plans." M. Jannet might have illustrated the evils he describes by a reference to the terrible scenes in Zola's *Germinal*, where the wretched miners, in blindly wrecking the outward and visible signs of their slavery, feel that even in so doing they leave untouched their real oppressor, who lives far away from the pit's mouth, far away indeed from the Parisian board of directors, and yet not far away, but here, there, and everywhere—that indefinable yet definite entity we call the "state of society." It is upon this indiscriminate mass that the forces of Christianity must be brought to bear. "Des doctrines philosophiques nouvelles," writes M. Jannet, "exaltent le *struggle for life* et prétendent faire d'observations d'histoire naturelle plus ou moins exactes la base de la morale humaine. La faveur qui les accueille témoigne trop bien de l'application pratique qu'elles trouvent. Le Paul Astier de Daudet est un type

poussé à l'extrême, comme il convient à la scène, mais non purement imaginaire. Le jour où ces coupables sophismes auraient remplacé la vieille morale chrétienne, on ne voit plus quelle barrière serait apportée au mal" (p. 542).

M. Jannet's book has its moral, and it is this. We English folk understand, perhaps better than any other nation, that the world of industry is governed by the consumer rather than by the producer. Political Economy once taught us that the value of an article was determined by the cost of its production; we now know that the converse is more nearly the truth. As we recognize that the whole body of consumers are the value-makers, we shall understand better and better the need for a democratic control of the agents of production. M. Jannet has, indeed, failed to attain to this higher view; French economic thought is hardly as yet at the stage of the Free Trade panacea: nevertheless, M. Jannet's accurate and lucid account of the good and evil of those financial institutions which we all, rich and poor alike, are wont to confide in without any sufficient inquiry into their morality or even their security, cannot fail to show how grave are the wrongs for which the merely passive good only too often make themselves responsible.

WALTER K. FIRMINER.

SCIENCE ET RELIGION. Par G. DE MOLINARI, Rédacteur en chef du *Journal des Économistes*. [284 pp. Crown 8vo. 3fr. 50c. Guillaumin. Paris, 1894.]

This work is the sequel to a previous one on *Religion*, reviewed in the *Economic Review* of October, 1892, but yet it forms an independent essay in itself. M. de Molinari is convinced that "religions have been in the past, and will continue to be in the future, the necessary agent in the preservation and progress of societies;" yet he fears that the intellectual classes are growing more and more sceptical, while irreligion is also spreading more and more in the lower layers of society. To the healing of this unhappy breach M. de Molinari contributes this very interesting inquiry into its cause, which he finds in the want of progress in religion—that is, in Christianity.

First, however, it is necessary to establish his premise as to the utility of religion. This is done very ably in part i., which is a brief, clear, and readable sketch of the origin and growth of civilized society; and the conclusion is, that the important factor to which is owing man's elevation out of the merely animal life and his subsequent civilized progress is religion. Even the moral sense of man is insufficient by

itself, for it depends upon religion ; and M. de Molinari uses words which might well be quoted by the advocates of Christian education : the State has undertaken the Church's task of education, "mais l'expérience n'a pas tardé à démontrer que la culture intellectuelle ne porte des fruits savoureux et sains qu'à la condition d'être accompagnée de la culture morale. Et celle-ci, avons-nous besoin de le répéter, ne peut être séparée de la culture religieuse. Sans un fondement religieux, tout l'édifice de la morale s'écroule " (p. 219). Science seems entering on a new phase, and the true scientist no longer blinds himself to the great influence which religion has exercised and does exercise on the growth of human society. So, too, the political philosopher has grown more human, we might say ; he finds that utilitarianism is an insufficient theory to account for the problem of society ; the "greater good of the greater number," though a beautiful motive on paper, is found inadequate to influence the average man, and to outweigh the interests and temptations which pull the other way. This is most frankly acknowledged by our author ; but perhaps he, also, is tempted to err on the side of too great simplicity and clearness. Human nature is so complex that other agents besides the laws of competition and of economy of forces must have been at work in the origin of civilization. Man, also, is more than a "natural being influenced solely by the motive of pain or of pleasure ;" the writer himself discusses two other motives—the sentiments of religion and of justice. To this last is ultimately reduced the moral sense, but in it we find no reference to the ideas of guilt or sin ; and in the sentiment of religion, fear and hope of gain are the only motives allowed, no account is taken of the sentiment of love.

It is, however, to the second part that we turn with more interest. The title "Progress of Religion" leads us to expect, as so often, a dissipation or dissolution of the doctrinal foundations of our religion in an ideal but somewhat unpractical and visionary philanthropy. But fortunately M. de Molinari only asks for the adaptation of the imaginative conceptions we form of our doctrines to the present state of our knowledge in other matters : for instance, the deepening and widening of our ideas of God and of creation which is necessitated by our geological and astronomical discoveries. This kind of progress we all gladly accept, and Churchmen who oppose themselves to all enlightenment should read this book to be convinced of the harm done by obscurantism and their responsibility for it. Progress, however, has taken place in the Church as well as outside, more than the writer perhaps realizes, when, for instance, he complains that, in the doctrine of the future state, while the joys of heaven are moral, the pains of hell are material. Perhaps the popular Roman teaching about the flames

of purgatory is responsible for this. The doctrines passed in review are the elementary ones about the existence of God and His relation to man, creation, the immortality of the soul, etc., and the Christian doctrines, when looked at from the new point of view, are found to be more reasonable than the scientific hypotheses given us in their place. The contradictions are few and in non-essential points, *e.g.* details in the account of creation, though M. de Molinari is over-scrupulous in finding a contradiction between the unceasing activity of the sidereal universe and the doctrine that God "rested" after creation. So it is excessively literal to conclude from the mention of the valley of Jehoshaphat in Joel that Christianity assumed the presence of a comparatively small number before the judgment-seat. M. de Molinari might indeed be a Catholic, and he appears to hold the Divinity of our Lord, though a brief allusion to that doctrine on p. 141 is extremely obscure.

Almost half of the second part is devoted to a discussion of the relations of Church and State. The author's social doctrine is apparently freedom of competition. The present evils are largely due to the immorality of governments and the restrictions which they still impose upon freedom of commercial enterprise. So in religion, present shortcomings are the consequence of the establishment and monopoly of particular religions in the past. This establishment was indeed inevitable, and the persecutions of the Church find an able apology; but the era of protection is past in religion as well as in politics. These chapters, then, present a strong argument for disestablishment, but the author admits that the semi-disestablishment in France has not freed the Church from imperfection (p. 179); and is the further complete separation of the Church from the State altogether possible?

In conclusion, M. de Molinari is full of hope for the future of religion and religious progress. "*Le temps a fait son œuvre. L'esprit nouveau a pénétré dans la vieille église. Les encycliques de Léon XIII., les discours du Cardinal Manning et des prélats américains, Mgr. Gibbon et Mgr. Ireland, en sont imprégnés. Et le jour n'est peut-être pas éloigné où la religion, reconciliée avec la science et la liberté, redeviendra ce qu'elle a été jadis : l'instrument divin de la conservation et du progrès des sociétés humaines*" (p. 208). In the appendix a pastoral of Leo XIII. when Archbishop of Perugia is quoted with enthusiasm, and our writer adds, "*Il est possible que des influences avec lesquelles un souverain omnipotent et même infallible est obligé de compter, effacent de la mémoire du Pape la Lettre pastorale de l'archevêque. Mais cette lettre n'en a pas moins été écrite. . . . Il y avait longtemps que la chaire de saint Pierre n'avait été occupée par un homme véritablement instruit, et Léon XIII. est bien certainement le*

premier Pape qui ait étudié l'économie politique. . . . L'auteur de la Lettre pastorale est un esprit aussi cultivé et aussi *moderne* qu'on peut l'être. Il n'appartient pas au passé, il est de son temps."

R. B. BACKHAM.

HANDBUCH DES SOCIALISMUS. Von C. STEGMANN, Jur.D., und C. HUGO, Ph.D. [Parts I. and II. Each 64 pp. 8vo. 80 *pf.* Schabelitz. Zürich, 1894.]

This is an alphabetical dictionary of Socialism, taken in the widest sense of "plans of social organization on a basis of collective ownership." The definition is unsatisfactory, and does not account for the inclusion of Le Play (p. 126), who preaches the doctrine of the *École charitable*: "Convert the employer and landlord, and make them patrons of their workmen; and do not let the State interfere with the adult labourer." But in another place Socialism is made to mean the desire to change the present political and social conditions for the benefit of the majority. This would include Mr. Labouchere!

There are obvious objections to the treatment of Socialism on an alphabetical basis. On the one hand, it is difficult to treat a theorist, an agitator, or a movement from a sufficiently historical point of view; to show how and why they arose, why they took their particular forms, and what part they play in the progress of the whole movement. Mrs. Besant, for instance, must seem, to the uninitiated, to have dropped as a sort of portent from a cloudless sky, setting fire to match-girls, London School Boards, and Theosophic Mahatmas from a sort of mysterious caprice (see p. 65). Too much space is devoted to the external machinery of societies, and to paper programmes and manifestoes. Page after page is covered with accounts of Anarchist movements, but there is no real explanation of the French and Russian circumstances which made Anarchism a thing to be expected in those countries. Another objection to the alphabetical method is the overlapping, the repetitions, and the cross divisions that generally result. Why should Mr. Headlam appear under "Christian Socialism," while W. H. P. Campbell gets a heading to himself? "Socialism" should not include most of the material proper to a dictionary of political economy, and one does not see why a really valuable literary work might not have been composed by the authors on the lines of Rae, Laveleye and Kirkup.

If the dictionary form must be chosen, the result should be a work expository and exhaustive. This ideal, however, is scarcely reached. The authors claim to be "objective" students, but it is harder to be objective than the authors think. On p. 9 we read of Bakunin's

“*unheilvolle Thätigkeit*,” and of Netchaieff’s “*Gauklereien* ;” on p. 20, of Proudhon’s “*wenig günstigen Einfluss* ;” on p. 50 the way of salvation for the peasant is dogmatically announced ; and on p. 119 the “*Christian Socialism*” of Herr Stöcker is derided and abused. As to English matters, Chartism is described at great length, but without a mention of the Bradford “*Republic*,” and of the work of Napier in combating the “*Physical Force*” party. On p. 83 we read of an Irish Land Nationalizer “*Patrice*.” Who is this ? The English Christian Socialist movement of the last ten years is dealt with most imperfectly, and in a way which would mislead the German inquirer. The movement is said to be due to the agitation of Henry George !

Yet, in spite of these faults, the work seems likely to be of some value for purposes of reference ; and, as the authors only profess to present “*ein gutes Bruchstück*,” we hope that they will some day produce a fuller work. They are somewhat too cheerful, however, in expecting that the prejudiced extremist of either side will be converted by a course of plodding through this handbook.

J. A. FALLOWS.

QUESTIONS OF THE DAY. By DAVID JAMES VAUGHAN, M.A., Hon. Canon of Peterborough Cathedral, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. [260 pp. Crown 8vo. 5s. Macmillan. London, 1894.]

This volume of sermons to working men ought to be read by every one who is interested in the “*Church forward movement*.” It is the fruit of twenty years’ experience of parochial work at Leicester ; and it contains valuable discussions on almost every pressing social problem. “*Christianity and Politics*,” “*Capital and Labour*,” “*Domestic Life*,” “*Co-operation*,” “*Trade Unionism*,” “*War*,” “*The Morality of Business*,” “*Secularism*,” “*The Temperance Movement*,” “*Disestablishment*,” “*The Church and Socialism*,”—such are the titles of these addresses. It would be difficult to speak too highly of the manner in which Mr. Vaughan handles these burning questions. His sympathy with the cause of labour is so ardent and genuine that he is not nervously eager to profess it : never once do we detect a false ring of demagogic rhetoric, or a tasteless attempt to speak from the pulpit in the language of the platform. He is not one of those who try to awaken interest in the Exodus by calling it a “*brick-layers’ strike* ;” in fact, he cannot repress a little scholarly shiver at being obliged to spoil his pure English by such “*barbarous*” terms as “*Trade-unionism*” and “*Collectivism*.” But

neither does he ever take refuge in sonorous platitudes when approaching a delicate question. Whatever, in his opinion, retards the progress of the cause of the workers, whether it be an economic fallacy or a moral weakness, evokes from him an earnest, fearless, and plain-spoken appeal. For instance, he fears that the co-operative societies are "descending to a lower level"—that of joint-stock companies; and that they may "introduce the working-classes to some of the worst vices of the classes socially above them;" he begs them, therefore, "to make such a disastrous perversion of their cause impossible." The special "fad" of Leicester—resistance to the vaccination law—is boldly attacked; and not less brave is his denunciation of the "criminality" of premature marriages, and the perhaps too sweeping indictment that "the whole matter of the relations between the sexes" (among the working-class) "requires a radical reform."

With Carlyle and Maurice, whom he often quotes, Mr. Vaughan asserts that "no relation between human beings can be satisfied by a mere money payment." In a splendid sermon on the "Morality of Business," he shows how "the worship of Mammon and the degradation of labour always go hand in hand," and asserts the duty of every labourer "to be something of an artist," and his indefeasible right "to be required to do nothing which tends to destroy an honest man's pleasure in his work." He caps this with an appeal to the unions "to support their members in refusing to do fraudulent and dishonest work." This is surely a suggestion which ought not to fall to the ground. He believes that there is a solution of the Labour question, and that, since "all legitimate interests are harmonious," peace and justice will be at length attained. The sermon on Tyre, which fell owing to "the iniquity of her traffic," is a stirring appeal, in the name of patriotism, to purify British commerce.

It is tempting to linger over some other noble discourses in this book, such as that on marriage, where he gives a prominent place to those lines from Tennyson's *Guinevere* which are the special abhorrence of all our "Decadents;" or the exceedingly interesting sermon called "Past and Present," in which the conditions of the labour-market at Leicester are contrasted with the conditions of fifty years ago; or the brilliant exposure of the futility of Agnosticism on pages 179, 180; or the recognition of the "incalculable benefits" which the critical study of the Bible has rendered to Christianity, the result of which has been "an ever-waxing admiration for the Person of Christ."

But it is impossible to do justice by excerption where all is so good. There is not a page of the book that is not worth reading carefully.

W. R. INGE.

SHORT NOTICES.

THESE EIGHTY YEARS. By HENRY SOLLY. [2 vols., 435, 574 pp. Simpkin, Marshall. London, 1893.]

To all Mr. Solly's friends—and their name is legion—these volumes are full of interest, and to those who know not the writer but are studying modern “movements” they have no small interest also. It must be said at once that the work lacks proportion, that the early chapters especially might have been compressed, and that here and there the reader comes across an inaccuracy or a slip in style. But it is far more pleasant in such a case to dwell on the brighter side. The volumes set before us an account of a life of singular enthusiasm, pure disinterestedness, and dauntless perseverance. It is difficult to say whether the man or his surroundings interest the reader most. We see Mr. Solly in youth striving with uncongenial employment and plunged into poverty by his father's failure. We watch him patiently waiting to marry his wife, and doing so in the end triumphantly. We have the story of his successive cures in the Unitarian ministry, and everywhere he is the same. The character of the man, its kindliness, its freedom from malice, its contagious zeal all come out, as it were, unconsciously. And then the societies he helped to form, the secretaryships he filled, the work he did! Well might one of his friends say of a premature attempt in the field of philanthropy, “If this is one of your failures, what must your successes be?” It is impossible to put down the book without reflecting that it contains the story of a life of high aims and patient effort, and without wishing the author yet more years of life, and of hope.

THE HISTORY OF THE ROCHDALE PIONEERS. By GEORGE JACOB HOLYOAKE. [xv., 191 pp. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. Sonnenschein. London, 1893.]

A tenth edition, revised and enlarged, is conclusive proof, if need there be, of the permanent value of the literary work of this veteran co-operator. The Co-operative Movement in England constitutes one of the best evidences of the stamina and capacity of the British working man, and has made its mark the world over, as may be seen from the interesting account of the number of translations that have been made of Mr. Holyoake's book into foreign languages. The present edition brings the history down to the Rochdale Congress of 1892, and is most of all encouraging because Mr. Holyoake still appears full of faith in

the old co-operative ideal—"not merely the better remuneration of labour, but its emancipation." A few sentences from his speech at the Rochdale Congress will serve to show that the zeal and enterprise of the reformer have not been extinguished. "We have done much to introduce honesty into trade. We have yet to establish honesty in industry. The adulteration and overcharges in provisions are as nothing to the adulteration of workmanship and under-payment of wages. We who have done so much to stop the higgling of the market, have now to arrest the higgling of the workshop. . . . Are we going to conduct a movement for the consumer only, and do nothing for the labourer? . . . Co-operative principles declare that division of profits applies not only to purchasers but to producers" (p. 183).

THE STATESMAN'S YEAR-BOOK. Statistical and Historical Annual of the States of the World for the Year 1894. Edited by J. SCOTT KELTIE, Assistant Secretary to the Royal Geographical Society. [xxxiii., 1152 pp. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d. Macmillan. London, 1894.]

This first-rate reference book requires no further recommendation. The thirty-first annual publication is quite up to the standard of former editions; the statistics have been renewed, and many additions and corrections have been made. For instance, the information about the navies of the world has been brought up to date, and will be found especially opportune at the present time.

THE DWELLINGS OF THE PEOPLE. By T. LOCKE WORTHINGTON, A.R.I.B.A.; with an Introduction by G. V. POORE, M.D., F.R.C.P. [xv., 164 pp. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. Sonnenschein. London, 1893.]

This little treatise, by a practical architect, fully deserves the warm recommendation of the medical authority who has written the brief preface. Despite the Report of the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes in 1885, fresh evidence has been laid before the present Labour Commission as to the very inadequate and insanitary conditions in which many of the poor still have to live. Mr. Worthington is urgent for the decentralization and diffusion of our congested populations in the large towns, though he recognizes the need, in certain cases, of well-constructed block-dwellings. His book is particularly valuable as showing what can be done under the existing law, and as offering suggestions for further improvements.

MINING ROYALTIES : Their Practical Operation and Effect.
By CHARLES ASHWORTH JAMES, Barrister-at-Law, late Fellow
of Hertford College, Oxford. [278 pp. Post 4to. 5s. Long-
mans. London, 1893.]

This is mainly a summary statement of the voluminous evidence published by the recent Royal Commission on Mining Royalties, in regard to the more important issues of that elaborate investigation. Mr. James's conclusions are that the British Mining System has been justified, and that intervention on the part of the State is not desirable. The book is lucidly arranged, and the general reader will find the subject made easier by the author's careful definitions and explanations.

THE EPILEPTIC AND CRIPPLED. [159 pp. Crown 8vo.
2s. 6d. Sonnenschein. London, 1893.]

The Charity Organization Society's Report on the Condition of Epileptic and Crippled Children and Adults, with suggestions for their better education and employment, is a valuable contribution to intelligent charity. Every effort has been made to get expert evidence, with the result that the conclusions arrived at carry conviction. All workers must, at some time or other, have been face to face with the difficulty of helping satisfactorily epileptics and cripples; as a rule, their tempers and education in their young days have been seriously damaged by over-indulgence or neglect; as they grow up they are unable to find employment because of their afflictions, and so inevitably, in the majority of cases, drift to the workhouse, where they become cynical and sullen, a burden to themselves and others. Contrast this with the account, so well given in this report, of the state of those in the various institutions, established at home and abroad, for their especial benefit, and there can be but one wish—to help on the work of the Charity Organization Society.

**MÉMOIRE SUR LA CHARGE FINANCIERE DES CAISSES
CONTRE LES MALADIES, À INSTITUER D'APRÈS
LE PROJET DE LOI FÉDÉRALE SUR L'ASSURANCE
CONTRE LES MALADIES.** [150 pp. 8vo. Stæmpfli.
Berne, 1893.]

A study—careful up to a certain point—by Dr. Moser, for the purpose of carrying out the Swiss law on sickness assurance. It is divided into two parts, (1) the determination of the premium to be paid in accordance with the law; (2) general mathematical studies on insurance against sickness. It is grounded chiefly on the experience

of the German and Austrian State systems, coupled with that of a Swiss society of eight thousand members ; but the absence of all reference to the large experience of our two great orders, the Manchester Unity of Oddfellows and the Ancient Order of Foresters, or to the labours of English actuaries, is remarkable.

With the above should be connected Dr. Moser's "*Materialien zu den Gesetzentwürfen betreffend Kranken und Unfallversicherung*," containing graphic representations of the influence of the insured duration of illness on the responsibilities of a fund for sickness and accident, the influence of the age of an entrant on the amount of the sickness premium, and various similar graphic tables, besides a non-graphic one as to the results available for accident insurance in Switzerland.

THE CO-OPERATIVE IDEAL.¹

GREAT ideas are of necessity slowly defined and slowly embodied, and, for the most part, through partial errors and failures. It has been so with the idea of Co-operation. When we consider the scope and the power of this idea, which is a master principle of life, it cannot appear strange to us that it has been found to be larger and more difficult of realization than it was supposed to be at first, and that successive embodiments have fallen very far short of the true conception, and in some degree missed it altogether. Co-operation, in its simplest sense, expresses the right organization of labour. Labour is the condition of healthy life, and labour ought never to be vain or conflicting. But co-operation is more than this. Co-operation defines the right relation, not only of the members of a society one to another, but of men as men bound together in the fellowship of one nature, one life, one destiny. Co-operation is the harmonious action of men and classes and nations, bringing together the ripe results of their powers, their endowments, their opportunities for the good of the race, as fellow-workers for the establishment of a divine unity, the crown of common service, and the reward of individual labour.

It may be said that the end of co-operation to which I have pointed is unattainable. At any rate, I do not think that it will be said that it is undesirable. And if we agree as to the ideal towards which human endeavour ought to be directed, we shall have a test of progress.

Such a test is not superfluous. Few words are used more confidently or exultingly, at the present day, than "progress;" but I cannot remember ever to have met with a clear definition

¹ An address delivered at the Co-operative Congress at Sunderland, on May 12, 1894.

of it. It does not follow that, if we are moving quickly, we are moving towards our desired goal. Change is not necessarily improvement. The accumulation of the instruments and means of living may destroy life: at the most they supply facilities for action; they include no assurance or promise of action which we should deliberately approve.

I admit that we are commonly satisfied with a narrower view of co-operation. I admit that, as yet, we have hardly approached the question of co-operation under its loftiest form in regard to the special fitnesses of the several nations for the fulfilment of special services to the race. But none the less I lay stress on the widest application of the principle. The whole influences the least part. The least part gains its proper dignity from the whole. If we are to estimate rightly the value of a single step, we must know and remember our end.

There are, indeed, two opposite lines of movement in social change which find advocates among us, the one towards uniformity of conditions, the other towards the development of personal differences; two opposite motives on which reformers rely, the immediate interest of the individual and the final good of the society; two opposite standards of success, material prosperity and nobility of character. We must, then, make our choice between these rival views of the aims and methods of life, before we can speak rightly of progress. Progress in regard to one is retrogression in regard to the other. Nor will the choice be difficult if we look away from the perplexing tumults of the day to the majestic record of nature and history. In the annals of life, as we can read them, there is a steady increase in the distinctness of parts and in the complexity of the whole: in the development of man there is a continual triumph of social interests over personal interests, as far as they fall within the range of our observation: in the final judgment of the world character is set before wealth as the most precious treasure of humanity.

As labourers together, therefore, for progress we shall guard ourselves from sacrificing the whole to the part, or the future to the present, or the spiritual to the material. We shall strive to

secure that each man, each class, each nation shall be enabled to bring to mankind that which is its proper service, without jealousy and without reserve; that the power of a wider vision and a larger sympathy shall control and discipline the impulses to selfish aggrandisement; that the loftiest thoughts shall find a natural home in every family.

For us, human progress, in a word, will be the advance "in many parts and in many fashions" towards the realization of that corporate life to the fulness of which every man brings his peculiar offering, and in which each man shares according to his capacity, all bringing alike and sharing, without waste and without self-assertion. And for this progress we shall gladly spend and be spent.

Such a conception of the end of life, which illuminates the study of personal, and national, and human development, however far it may seem to be removed from our present circumstances, has a definite bearing on the problems which meet us from day to day, on the problem of co-operative production which is before us now. If we accept it, it will guide us in choosing our line of action, and bring something of the enthusiasm of a great cause even into small efforts. Clearly recognizing our end, we shall welcome all forms of association which tend in any degree to bring us nearer to it.

Thus, in seeking for improvements in the conditions of industry and commerce, we shall not think simply of higher wages, or of cheaper production, or of the advancement of one class, but rather of reconciling interests which appear to be conflicting, of developing trustful fellowship between those who have to fulfil different functions, of making labour itself, in all its different forms, a true human life and not a provision for living. To this end, keeping our ideal full in view, we shall consider from time to time what element in the ideal may be realized, what is the next step towards the goal which can be securely taken.

In this light, co-operative production in a wide sense—the copartnership of all fellow-workers, of undertakers, that is to say, artificers, merchants, distributors—is seen to be a clear and

possible advance towards industrial concord. It marks a stage in national growth. It has a moral value which is even greater than its economic value. It is a combination of all, through all, for all. In its scope it goes beyond the limits to which it has hitherto been confined: beyond the range of the Rochdale programme, while it follows out the same lines: beyond the two alternatives of Mr. Mill, who thought that the industry of the future would be organized, either in associations of labourers with capitalists, or in associations of labourers among themselves. It takes account of "engineering" in business, which is the function of genius, no less than of routine. Ideally, co-operative production includes in one fellowship all who are engaged in any work, however different in function, and gives to all a proportionate share in the profits of the business, and in the control of the administration.

Such an ideal, even if we can only approach it at present tentatively and from afar, and I fully allow that we can do more, demands serious consideration. It answers to the present stage of our social evolution. It offers a solution of some urgent problems. It has already proved its value. It is in an especial sense an appeal to England.

Let me say a few words on each of these four points; and if I touch on great subjects most briefly and imperfectly, believe at least that I speak with a conviction which has never wavered during the five and twenty years through which I have studied them with the keenest interest.

1. The time, I say, is opportune for the establishment of co-operative production. The individual, after a struggle of four centuries, has gained, in England at least, his complete enfranchisement. But the development of personal liberty has placed in the strongest light the necessity for association. Men cannot stand alone: we gain freedom that we may advance to union. So the age is characterized by a variety of partial combinations, some of them illegal till seventy years ago, by friendly societies, trade-unions, federations of workmen and of capitalists. Hitherto the combinations have been mainly directed to special objects or to the interests of separate classes, but none the less they have

given distinctness and dignity to the different forces which combine to produce social and commercial results. We have learnt to feel with practical effect the reality of human dependence and solidarity. The extension of political power and education throughout the people has brought on the one side a deeper sense of responsibility, and on the other side a stronger desire for justice. The genial condescension of the patriarchal system fails to satisfy the spirit of the time, which is still less inclined to respect the good old rule,—

the simple plan,
That they should take who have the power,
And they should keep who can.

At the same time, the Great Industry and the continuous improvement of machinery have limited the direct expression of individuality in craftsman and artist. Capitalists, as has been pointed out often, have inherited a large share of feudal power without feudal obligations. We need therefore—this is the general conclusion to which all these facts lead—some industrial organization corresponding to the old military organization, an organization of service in place of an organization of force, which shall at once guard great powers, possessions, traditions, as a common inheritance, and supply noble interests and the opportunity of generous activity to every workman. Privilege, if rightly interpreted, is a call to special devotion. Fellowship in labour is the condition of happy and lasting peace.

We want, I say, an organization of industry which shall stir enthusiasm like the military organization of the Middle Age. Nor should this appear to be an impracticable desire. There is nothing in the character and conduct of war which gives to the soldier a monopoly of lofty devotion. Peace offers fields to be won by equal sacrifices. It is surely no less honourable, and it is certainly no less difficult, to discipline the forces of a people in effective production, than to direct them in efforts of desolating violence. Manufactures, commerce, trade, agriculture, if once the thought of personal gain is subordinated to the thought of public service, offer scope for the most chivalrous and enterprising and courageous. It can only be through some

misapprehension that it seems to be a nobler duty to lead a regiment to the battle-field than to inspire the workers in a factory with the enthusiasm of labour. The time will come before long, as I trust, when leaders of men shall plant colonies and dress and keep strange wildernesses, and win for themselves the honours of founders; when not a few merchants and dealers will take up the challenge which has been offered to them, and say what they are ready to die for.

Then the arts of peace will be seen in their true grandeur; then, purified from all that is selfish and sordid, they will attract the noblest servants of the commonwealth; then citizens and, in due time, nations will be labourers together in a kingdom of God.

Such thoughts are in the air, and, when we look on the ideal which gives them shape, I think that we feel that it answers to desires within us. The glory of the whole is seen in our estimate of each smallest part; our estimate of each smallest part contributes to our vision of the glory of the whole. It is no descent, then, if we pass from the ideal to the humble preparations for it which we welcome to-day. For even on the narrowest scale, industrial copartnership is a step, an irretraceable step, towards the end for which we are bound.

2. This will appear, if we consider a little more closely what industrial copartnership—productive co-operation as I have defined it—includes. We are all agreed that the greatest obstacle to social concord is want of confidence between man and man, and between class and class. If once we can be satisfied that all work for each, and that each works for all, then there will be among us “righteousness, peace, joy,” the signs of that kingdom for the advent of which we pray. Confidence springs from knowledge. At present it is difficult to say whether the employed is more ignorant of the difficulties, the troubles, the anxieties of the employer, or the employer of the trials and the temptations and the vital conditions of the employed. How many shareholders in a colliery, for example, visit the homes of the pitmen? How many pitmen understand the weary, sleepless nights which follow baffled calculations?

But copartnership in work, bringing natural opportunities for confidential intercourse, must become to employer and employed alike a revelation of life. On the one side, an insight into the actual conditions of commerce, into the disturbing forces of competition and circumstance, is an education, fruitful perhaps in problems which await solution. On the other side, a sympathetic understanding of the wants, the aspirations, the hopes of those who are feeling their way to the true claims and obligations of labour is—I speak of that which I know—a spring of deep encouragement. If it is ennobling to the employed to feel that they have a share, real if small, in a great business: it is no less ennobling to the employer to feel that those who work *with*, and not only *for*, him can enter into his cares. On both sides, frank, sympathetic interchange of thought must produce a sense of fellowship, of unity, growing out of mutual dependence and strengthened by pride in the results of common work.

No doubt, even in this copartnership, occasions for difference are still left. If, for example, it is agreed that any profits which remain after the normal payment of labour and capital are to be divided among the workers, the proportion in which they are to be divided between workers of different classes has to be decided. But the just decision will be easier if it is sought in friendly intercourse by those who have the power and the opportunity of understanding the whole, and are directly capable of forming a clear judgment as to the proportion which is likely to secure an adequate supply of capital and labour, than when half-blind claims are pressed by force.

In any case there will be differences of capacity and skill and energy among workers of the same class; and the old question will be asked, Are all to have the same reward? All, I reply without doubt, who are found worthy to work ought to receive the same material reward, which makes the work possible for them. That is the very meaning of wages. The weakest perhaps may require the most sympathy and care where all receive consideration. But there are other rewards, which follow infallibly according to deserving, the joy of generous

service and uncalculated efforts, and not unfrequently the recognition of grateful hearts.

Shall the artisan's pay, it is said again, depend on the undertaker's skill? Again I reply, Why not? Is it not of necessity always so? Is not the soldier's honour in the hands of his captain? And will not the captains of industry be stirred by this thought, no less than the leaders in war?

When we take account of such influences as these, it seems likely that the material results of a business conducted by workers bound together in a copartnership of labour will be better than those which are secured under the ordinary conditions.

But the results of such a copartnership as we contemplate are not to be measured by increased economy and efficiency. It may entail, at least for a time, sacrifices on both sides. The employer may gain less, and the employed may give more. But what then? Great changes—and great changes in the conditions of labour are assuredly imminent—may demand them. And shall they not be made gladly? We are all ready to offer our substance and our lives, if need be, for our country; and shall we not be ready to offer both for the welfare of our fellow-citizens? Men are more than wealth. Common experience proves the Divine saying true, that he who will lose his life shall not save it only, but bring it to a fuller birth. And perhaps we have all found that our highest satisfaction lies in looking forward, with a confident hope that those who come after will reap in joy the harvest which we have sown not unfrequently in tears. If our immediate interests are surrendered, we too have a share in the life which shall be. Thus there is a sense in which we can realize that the highest good of the individual who seems to perish is found in the highest good of the whole. The thought of the future which we are all shaping is able to chasten and to support us. We do not, we cannot, pity the man who falls in a heroic venture. We are stronger by his example; and we cannot believe that he himself is a loser.

Thus in many ways the spirit of co-operation, even when it

asks much of him who takes his place as a fellow-worker with a varied company, makes him at the same time more sensitive, through larger sympathy, to "joy in widest commonalty spread." This sympathy, this power of larger vision, this delight in furthering a great cause, grows as our interests grow, and with its growth the passion for a fuller growth grows also. Such a passion supplies a motive strong enough to stimulate and sustain individual energy and creative force.

For co-operation does not dispense with leadership. It directs to the fulfilment of social functions the power which becomes perilous when it is used for private gain. We reach comparatively soon the standard of a simple, cultured life; and all beyond is valued chiefly as a sign of success, which can be attested in less ambiguous ways.

3. The manifest tendency of industrial association to produce these results, to remove the suspicion and unrest, to check the unreflecting self-assertion, to displace the sordid quest for gain, which trouble modern commerce and manufacture, has been established by experience. Even when tried imperfectly and on a small scale, co-operative production has vindicated the claims which theorists have made for it. I will not repeat what others have recorded from their own experience in instructive detail. It is enough to remind you that capitalists have been found willing to make financial sacrifices which, they say, have brought them a satisfying return; that workmen have responded generously to the generosity of employers; that the feeling of fellowship, essentially different from the fear of loss, has developed among partners in industry effort, intelligence, pride in the results of labour. And if it be argued that the actual addition to wages which has been obtained by "profit-sharing" is relatively small, and might have been gained in other ways, I can only say that the feeling of partnership is not measurable by money. It carries work at once to a higher level.

So it has been that, after the lessons of early failure, the cause of co-operative production has gone forward, surely, if slowly. Others have told the story. I will only remark that

one of its latest victories promises to epoch-making. It was not unusual to quote, till quite lately, the action of the Scottish Wholesale against the principle of the copartnership of labour. Now that that typical society has adopted the principle both in respect to profits and to administration, we may expect that the example will spread southwards.

4. The development of co-operation is, indeed, specially a work for England. The Great Industry was created here. Here, then, we may reasonably look for the discovery of the remedy to the evils which it has brought. Our social evolution has been stable and continuous. There is no sharp division of classes among us. Mutual understanding is comparatively easy. Individuals pass continually from one class to another. The National Church has retained in some measure its old characteristic, and united all classes by sympathetic contact. We are familiar with orderly change. Every shade of opinion finds free and vigorous expression. In spite of all our differences, we are one nation, proud of a great past and confident of a great future. What we have overcome and achieved teaches us to look forward with hope. The silent revolution of the last sixty years has consolidated the unity which at first it seemed to threaten. The general spirit of our people rejoices in the common life fed from many sources. It is therefore easier here than elsewhere to recognize that collectivism would impoverish life, and is essentially selfish, sacrificing the future to the present—"the more" who shall be, to the living generation. We are apt to forget or to disparage this splendid heritage of a true national unity. It is well that foreign students should remind us of it. Let me, then, quote, though I have quoted the words before, the witness of a German who knows Durham well:—

In England "the knowledge, religion, and culture of the upper classes nowhere wakes the opposition of the lower, for it is their own knowledge, religion, and culture, and they are more and more conscious of being the heirs and participators of its blessings. Church and University stand impartially above the parties, as representatives of public opinion withdrawn from the political struggle; and the

people, instead of looking askance at them as class institutions, realize that they are a possession of their own, which they are more and more fully grasping.”¹

Now, I venture to say that this unique heritage, this common enjoyment of the highest forces for inspiring and disciplining a generous character, not only prepares us to face the problems of the organization of industry as a fellowship of service, but lays on us the obligation of doing so. The life of nations is a mission no less than the life of men. And, unless the teaching of history misleads us, this is part of the mission of England. May the will answer to the call:—

Men, upon the whole,
Are what they can be,—nations, what they would.

At the same time, we are now fairly able to determine the circumstances under which the organization must be undertaken. Experience has shown that the greatest economy of production is secured in a business confined within reasonable limits, and requiring no more capital than a combination of co-operators can secure. A wise choice of enterprises in the first instance will train agents through established routine for tasks requiring vigorous and independent judgment. In this way, step by step, the Great Industry, full of dangers as it seemed to be at first, will—may we not dare to prophesy?—be made to contribute to the material and moral elevation of all who are engaged in it, not as separate or conflicting units, but as parts of the social organism.

The end can only be reached by patience and by sustained effort. It can only be reached by many partial and tentative experiments in different directions, which will all have an educational value if the ideal is kept in view. It can only be reached—and let me lay stress on this—by the intelligent help of consumers no less than of producers. We who use are, in a great degree, responsible for the worst vices of competition. We fail to realize the temptations which our passion for cheapness or our irregularity in payments offers to those who

¹ Von Schulze-Gävernitz, *Social Peace*, pref., pp. xix., xx.

minister to our wants. Every purchase which tends to encourage unhealthy production is an offence against our common brotherhood. I know how hard it is to learn the history of the goods which we buy. At least we should strive to learn it, and be prepared to establish, even through inconvenience and loss, a real sympathy with all the unknown toilers who support and adorn our life, so that when we meet hereafter face to face they may not reproach us with having inflicted upon them in their helplessness wilful or thoughtless wrong.

It will be said by some that the thoughts which I have offered to you are the thoughts of a student or a dreamer. I have indeed conversed gladly with the great of all ages; I have striven to lift my eyes to the mountains: but from my boyhood I have also been familiar with the life of the poor. I know something of their trials and of their desires. With that knowledge I rejoice to welcome them as fellow-workers for the greatest of earthly objects. I have assumed that they, that all men, can be quickened with the spirit of self-devotion and contemplate with steady hope a great if distant ideal. I have assumed that men can live for one another if they can live for God; that they can work with one another if they are called to work with God. Such assumptions are not vain unless our Creed is vain. Can we question that those are capable of human fellowship who are capable, as we believe, of a Divine fellowship? Men grow stronger as more is demanded from them. They respond when they are reminded of their true selves. But we to whom wider knowledge has been granted too often dwarf characters by failing to require from others what we ourselves are willing to give; by failing, that is, as Hinton said, "to love them as ourselves."

And the co-operative movement is, in fact, popular in its origin, like all great social movements. For where the force of custom lies least heavily there social instincts are purest and most powerful. But co-operation has never wanted enthusiastic advocates in all classes. The movement is from the masses, but it is not confined to them. The fact is of momentous importance. It is in the predominance of the social instincts that we

now find our surest trust. The preparation for the future lies in the recognition of the unity of humanity as a living whole, interdependent in all its parts. Our task, then, is to bring this transcendent thought into our daily relations; for effective service is only possible when we are assured of the nobility of the issues of life. Such an assurance has been given to us; and I should be false to my deepest convictions if I dissembled my own belief that a spiritual power, a Divine fellowship, is necessary for the attainment of our end, and that it is offered to us. Christianity won its social victories in the first ages by extending the affection of the family to the household of faith. So the love of the brethren became the sign and the promise of the love of men.

It is for us, under new conditions, to bring the sacred lessons of the family to the solution of larger problems. Happily the family is left to us, honoured still by the nation's reverence, as our social inheritance from the religious Reformation of the sixteenth century. In the family is the type of the co-operation for which we look,—not an impossible and death-bringing equality of conditions, but a glad fellowship in service.

For you will observe that the subordination of individual to social instincts, which, as history shows us, is the law of the progress of the race, is the strength and the joy of the family, the strength and the joy of co-operation. Progress, no doubt, will continue under the same conditions as in the past. This law, that is the will of God, which the "law" represents for us, must find fulfilment. But what will be the difference for us, as we resist it or make it the rule of our own efforts? To welcome it, to follow it, as we are enabled, is to enter into the joy of the Lord, *not to be ministered unto, but to minister*.

Thus we see that the ideal of co-operation is coincident with the conception of the family, with the highest hope of life, and that the humblest fellowship in labour contributes something towards its attainment. If then, as has been said, combinations are likely to play a great part in the future, I ask you to use the opportunity, and to make them fellowships in service, extensions of the family.

I ask you as co-operators to cherish your noblest thoughts even in the fulfilment of your simplest duties.

I ask you to think of those who will enter hereafter on the fruits of your work, when you are pressed by importunate temptations to self-assertion and self-indulgence.

I ask you to be good stewards of the inheritance which you have received as citizens of the English nation.

The present rules the future as the past rules the present. The ideal which we cherish, that "which we aspire to be," gives the character to our life. This will survive us.

B. F. DUNELM.

COMPENSATION AND THE LICENSING QUESTION.

THERE is a general consensus of opinion that an extensive and immediate reduction in the number of licensed drinking-houses throughout the country is essential to the promotion of sobriety. Long ago Charles Kingsley said—

“One thing is clear : that if this present barbarism and anarchy of covetousness, miscalled modern civilization, were trained and drilled into something more like a Kingdom of God on earth, then we should not see the reckless and needless multiplication of liquor-shops, which disgraces the country now. . . . There must come a thorough change in the present licensing system. . . . And it is the duty of every good citizen, who cares for his countrymen, and for their children after them, to help in bringing about that change as speedily as possible.”

That which in Kingsley's time was the “fad” of the fanatic is now accepted almost universally as reasonable and right : for that the maintenance of an excessive number of drinkshops is a wrong to the community, and that a remedy for the evil—to whatever cause it may be due—must be found, is now admitted on all hands.

The present Government has proposed to give the ratepayers the power to extinguish drinking-shops by means of the Local Veto, whilst the late Government proposed to invest local authorities with the power to buy up and extinguish unnecessary licenses. Setting aside for the moment the issue upon which the late purchase scheme was challenged (*viz.* whether a licensee has a moral right to be compensated when an unnecessary license is extinguished because it is unnecessary), the rejected proposals constituted an emphatic declaration that, in the opinion of their promoters, the reduction of licensed houses is of so

paramount importance that, if it is necessary to do so, Parliament must find the money to effect that object.

During a recent session of Parliament four Bills were introduced, which varied as widely in machinery and method as their sponsors differed in politics and religion. The Bishop of London's Bill, which has the support of the C.E.T.S.; the Bishop of Chester's Bill, which has the sanction of the Duke of Westminster and Mr. Chamberlain; the Manchester Bill, which is approved by Sir Henry Roscoe, the Bishop of Manchester, and Cardinal Vaughan; and the Westminster Bill, which was favourably received in the House of Commons, and for which Mr. Bolitho, Mr. Leonard Courtney, and Mr. Shepherd Little stand sponsors, all contain provisions for reducing the number of licensed drinking-houses to the proportion of one per thousand of the population in towns, and one per five hundred or six hundred of the population in the country. Observe that these are not prohibition measures. It is the suppression of unnecessary "liquor-shops" which is an object common to all these otherwise diverse proposals. Their promoters recognize that a large portion of the liquor trade is engaged in supplying the reasonable wants of sober men, and therefore cannot—in the present state of public opinion as to the physiological properties and as to the dietetic or medicinal value of alcoholic drinks—be suppressed. All these Bills contain provisions for exempting from their restrictive operation railway refreshment-rooms for the accommodation of persons arriving or departing by train, and hotels and restaurants for the use of persons lodging or taking meals there. They are all attempts to restore the public-house to its original purpose, of affording refreshment and rest to man and beast, and to curtail the modern "tippling house" which the legislature never intended should be established.

The object of this paper is to consider what it is that blocks the way, and prevents one, or other, or a combination of the best parts of all these Bills from being enacted without delay. Is it not because the conscience of the nation has not yet decided what equitable consideration should be shown to well-

conducted license-holders on the extinction of their licenses, and because, until this has been settled, nothing effectual will be done? Some may say that the decision of the House of Lords in the recent well-known case of *Sharpe v. Wakefield* closed that question, and that, as a license is annual, and no absolute right of renewal exists (except as regards what are known as the "1869 beer-houses"), no claim for compensation can possibly be entertained. Counsel for the publican in *Sharpe v. Wakefield* pointed out to the Law Lords that the case raised the question whether a person who had been in the enjoyment of a license for many years, and who had conducted himself properly, was to find himself—without any misconduct on his part, and from circumstances beyond his own control—deprived of that upon which, if treated as a subject-matter of property, he had expended his money. It was also urged upon their Lordships that their decision would cover an enormous amount of property, and prejudicially or otherwise affect a vast number of persons, and that the legislature could never have intended that this property should be jeopardized because the licensing magistrates have been so improvident as to license from time to time a larger number of houses than the needs of localities require. Lord Chancellor Halsbury replied that he was unable to assent to this argument about injustice, and the House of Lords unanimously decided that the licensing justices have the same discretion in the case of an application for what is now termed a renewal as in the case of a person applying for a license for the first time. An applicant for a new license has no legal right to compensation if his application be refused, and an applicant for a renewal stands on the same footing. But Christian citizens are bound to consider whether law and equity met in this important Judgment?

And first let me point out that, whether the decision in *Sharpe v. Wakefield* is a conclusive bar to claims for compensation or not, it undoubtedly, upon this question, changed the centre of gravity. If the decision had been the reverse of what it was, the nation would have had to pay whatever indemnity the trade thought fit to levy for national deliverance from the

evils of intemperance; but the Judgment being what it is, the trade will have to accept whatever compassionate allowance the nation may think fit to make, and I feel proud of the old temperance veterans who taught me, nearly thirty years ago, that every public-house license was granted for one year and no longer. To the general public the decision came as a surprise: to the intelligent temperance reformer it was the natural outcome of years of persistent advocacy. But even yet many persons regard the decision as a legal quibble, contrary to the spirit and intention of the legislature, and therefore very unfair to licensed persons.

Most of the existing public-house licenses were granted for the first time long before the year 1872, under an Act passed in the reign of George IV. Now, the chief arguments used before the House of Lords in favour of vested interests in licenses were derived—not from the licensing Act of George IV., under which the licenses were originally granted, but from an obscure clause in the Licensing Act of 1874—*i.e.* a Statute passed less than twenty years ago. How, then, can it be contended that it has been understood from time immemorial that a license would be annually renewed unless from some misconduct on the part of the licensed person? Again: is it not clear that in the year 1869 the legislature knew that no vested interest had been created under the Statute of George? In that year the free-trade beer-houses, instituted in the year 1832, were placed under magisterial control, and this was done by declaring that the provisions of the Act of George IV. should in future apply to these free-trade beer-houses. If the legislature had been of opinion that the Act of George IV. gave a vested interest during the good behaviour of the licensed person, no further protection to the free-trade beer-house keepers would have been necessary. But the legislature, knowing that public-house licenses might be extinguished whenever the licensing authority thought they were unnecessary, and being of opinion that free-trade beer-house keepers ought to have their rights reserved to them, it was expressly enacted that free-trade beer-house licenses which were in existence on the 1st of May, 1869,

should be exempted from the unlimited discretion as regards renewal which existed under the Statute of George IV., and that their renewal should only be refused upon one or more of four grounds specified in the Act of 1869. This, I think, effectually disposes of the claim which is so often made that the legislature—until the decision in *Sharpe v. Wakefield*—believed and intended that licenses were renewable by right during the good behaviour of the person holding the license, and therefore that the decision in *Sharpe v. Wakefield* is a “surprise” decision, which ought not in fairness to be enforced. But the legislature has not stopped there. By the Act of 1869, already referred to, outdoor beer-licenses became vested interests, and they continued to be so for upwards of ten years. In the years 1880 and 1882 this vested interest was destroyed by Parliament, and the method adopted to accomplish this was to give to the licensing justices, with regard to outdoor licenses, precisely the same absolute discretion which they always had under the Act of George IV. to deal with publicans’ licenses.

Apart from express legal enactment, there are other grounds upon which trade advocates claim compensation.

In the *Fortnightly Review* for May, 1893, appeared an article written on behalf of the Trade, in which the writer, Mr. Charles Walker, alleges that the denial of compensation to licensed victuallers is so barefaced a piece of robbery that the English people will never countenance it. Mr. Walker gives as his first reason for this sweeping assertion that, although the licensing authority has unlimited discretion with regard to the renewal or refusal of licenses, the justices must exercise their discretion according to the rules of reason and justice, not according to private opinion—according to law, and not to humour. I think Mr. Walker is here quite right; but we must go a step further, and ask what are the points upon which the justices are to exercise this judicial discretion? Are they not these: that the justices are to be satisfied that the applicant is a suitable person to keep a public-house, that the premises are suitable for the trade and easy of supervision, and that the number of the houses in the neighbourhood is not excessive? Mr. Walker

says that it was the intention of the legislature that licenses should be renewed unless reason could be shown for their refusal, and in this again he is right; but he overlooks the fact that the legislature never intended that an unnecessary number of licenses should be granted, or that the magistrates, urged by trade advocates, should act with improvidence, and license from time to time a larger number of persons than the needs of the locality required. But, as the late Mr. Montagu Williams said, licenses in some localities have been scattered like grains of pepper from a pepper-box; and not even Mr. Walker will deny that the magistrates are empowered to refuse to renew whatever publicans' licenses are not needed by the inhabitants of the neighbourhood.

Mr. Walker next contends that, subsequent to the decision of *Sharpe v. Wakefield*, it has been held in the Law Courts that if a licensed house is taken compulsorily—say, by a Municipal or County Council—for public purposes, compensation must be paid on the basis of the value of the licensed premises, the license being regarded as a fixed and permanent appanage. Mr. Walker here misunderstands, and, consequently, overstates his own case. The Law Courts have undoubtedly held that licensed premises required by public authorities are not to be valued as if the license would expire at the end of the year for which it has been granted; but that is very far short of saying that the value must be taken as if the license was a fixed and permanent appanage.

Lord Selborne has defined the interest of a publican in his license as an interest for a year, with a *locus standi* for renewal, precarious and depending upon the exercise of judicial discretion, in case of opposition. Now, in valuing public-house property for public purposes, every element of value must be taken into account, *e.g.* the house, the business, the license, for a year, and the chance—not the right, but the chance—of getting a renewal from year to year in the future. Persons watching the course of events in the past have seen that licenses—even to ill-conducted houses—have usually been renewed, and they have been willing to pay large sums of money for the

chance of renewal, and thus a license has acquired a market value. Every buyer of publicans' licenses knows that the moment it is determined, either by Parliament, or in any way appointed by Parliament, that any given number of licenses are unnecessary, the chance of renewal will have gone, and the purchasers' rights—no matter what may have been paid for them—will cease.

Mr. Walker mentions four other circumstances which are part of the practice of dealing with licenses in support of his contention. These are—first, that when the Chancellor of the Exchequer estimates his income for the financial year, he assumes that existing licenses will be renewed, and that his income from the trade will remain unaffected. Secondly, that when a publican dies, the valuation of his estate for purposes of probate duty is always based upon the calculation that the license is a permanency. Thirdly, that practical men, whose business it is to lend money upon a mortgage, always act upon a similar assumption. And, fourthly, that, as a matter of fact, licenses usually are renewed unless there is some strong and special reason why they should not be. And he contends that, under these circumstances, the publican has a reasonable right to expect a renewal, that his expectation is a valuable one which has always commanded a sale price in the market, and that to deprive a publican of this property by Act of Parliament is to give him as fair and strong a claim to compensation as the House of Commons has ever had to consider. Before examining these reasons in detail, let me point out that Mr. Walker has failed to distinguish between a "right" to renewal and a reasonable right to "expect" a renewal. If a publican had a right to renewal his case would be strong; if he had an unqualified right to expect a renewal—as, for example, if licenses were granted and renewed to well-conducted men at suitable houses, without reference to the needs of the neighbourhood—his case would still be strong; but seeing that proof that each license is needed is a condition precedent alike to its grant and renewal, the claim for compensation on the extinction of an unnecessary license vanishes. A publican has

a right to expect a renewal only so long as grounds exist upon which, if he were an applicant for a new license, he would have a right to expect that his application would be granted—that is, so long as a license is required in the neighbourhood. Everything depends upon whether a license is needed or not. Whatever licenses are necessary ought to be renewed, alike in the interests of the public and of the publican, but whatever licenses are unnecessary ought to be suppressed in the interests of the public; and the fact that they are unnecessary constitutes in itself a strong and special reason why they should not be renewed.

Dealing briefly with Mr. Walker's four grounds, it is only necessary to say—

1. That the Chancellor, in framing his budget, deals with probabilities only. I dare say that in April, 1893, he expected that coal and railway companies would earn as good dividends and pay as much income-tax as in 1892. I am afraid he was disappointed, but I do not think Parliament will compensate the unfortunate shareholders on that account.

2. Probate duty is always assessed on the market value, no matter whether the value is permanent or precarious, and Parliament has never on that account undertaken not to destroy or diminish the values upon which Death duties are levied. For instance, probate duty is levied on leasehold cottages according to their market value, but Parliament has empowered sanitary authorities to condemn as unfit for human dwelling insanitary property, and thus to destroy its annual value, and diminish its selling price, without compensation.

3. It is true that practical men buy and sell, and lend money upon licenses on the assumption that they will be renewed, but they do so, knowing the risks they run, for the sake of the high profits which often accompany precarious speculations.

4. I have already pointed out that licenses are granted upon three conditions, one of which is that they are needed, and wherever this essential condition is missing a claim to compensation cannot be sustained.

Mr. Walker next appeals to Parliamentary precedent, to

depart from which he says would be "to commit a monstrous injustice, and bring dishonour and disgrace upon the whole country." We must therefore follow Mr. Walker into this part of the subject, and see if he finds a firmer foothold there. Parliament, he says, compensated the Proctors on the introduction of the new Probate practice more than thirty years ago, although no harm was done to them, since their opportunities of practice were really extended by the Probate Act. The first answer to this is that Proctors did not carry on their professional monopoly under annual licenses; and, further, Parliament has, since the passing of the Probate Act, interfered with the practice of other branches of the legal profession and abolished much remunerative work, but has invariably neglected or refused to follow the precedent which Mr. Walker now claims in his favour. During the present Parliament a Land Transfer Bill has twice passed through the House of Lords, and now awaits discussion in the House of Commons. It was supported by leading statesmen of both political parties, and its effect will be to transfer from private solicitors to public departments a very large portion of the conveyancing business of the country. There are differences of opinion as to whether this transfer will be advantageous to the public or not, and upon that ground alone will the Bill be passed or rejected; but the private interests of the solicitors, which will be prejudiced by the Bill, will neither be compensated nor permitted to stand in the way of a desirable reform.

Mr. Walker next reminds us that Parliament, on the abolition of purchase in the Army, compensated officers who, in flagrant defiance of the Army rules, had paid over-regulation prices for their Commissions. This is true, but the officers were servants of the Crown, and when Parliament was changing the conditions under which they were in future to serve, it had a right to give fair and even generous terms. Publicans are not servants of the Crown. They have obtained their licenses for their own benefit as traders, and no one would contend that an employer, who had acted generously when discharging some of his employees, should be called upon to act with a similar generosity

to a shopkeeper or tradesman with whom he had found it unprofitable any longer to carry on business.

Lastly: Mr. Walker claims that because Parliament compensated the slave-owners this is a precedent which ought to be followed by granting compensation on the extinction of unnecessary licenses. But is not the slavery precedent, so far as it is applicable, against the claim for a full indemnity to all persons injured by the withdrawal of licenses, which Trade advocates put forward? Prior to the abolition of slavery the law recognized slaves as the property of the slave-holders during the lives of the slaves, whilst the law recognizes property in a license for one year only, with a *locus standi*—as Lord Selborne says—to apply for a renewal, which application may be granted or refused.

Further, the slave-owners received no compensation for loss of trade on the abolition of slavery, nor even the full value of their slaves. The average sale value of a slave between the years 1822 and 1830 in Bermuda was £27 4s. 11½d. The rate of compensation per slave paid to the slave-owners of Bermuda was £12 10s. 5d. only. In Barbadoes the average sale value of a slave between the years 1822 and 1830 was £47 1s. 3½d. The rate of compensation per slave was £20 13s. 8½d. In the Cape of Good Hope the average sale value from 1822 to 1830 was £73 9s. 11d. per slave, whilst the rate of compensation was £34 11s. 7½d. It is clear, therefore, that the slave-owners bore themselves a large portion of the loss; but I do not find in Mr. Walker's article any proposal that the slavery precedent should be followed in this respect with regard to public-house licenses.

Again: legal and Parliamentary practice with regard to licenses is altogether opposed to the claim to compensation. There is an unbroken chain of decisions from the time of George the Fourth to the present date, to the effect that in considering applications for licenses, whether for the first time or by way of renewal, the buildings themselves, their character, their number, and their neighbourhood, should be considered.

Parliament, in the year 1869, by Sir Selwin Ibbetson's Act

in the year 1877, by Mr. Meldon's Act; and in 1880 and 1882, by two short Bills carried through the House of Commons by Mr. Ritchie—brought about the extinction of thousands of licenses without compensation. These precedents—to use a familiar phrase—"are on all fours" with the proposals now made by the Local Veto and other Bills to diminish the number of drink-shops, and they form a much stronger precedent against compensation than any of the circumstances mentioned in Mr. Walker's article, nay, even than all those circumstances put together, form an argument in his favour.

These being my views on the case put forward on behalf of the Trade, readers will begin to ask how I reconcile them with the statement made at the outset, that the conscience of the nation has not yet decided what equitable consideration is necessary to secure the early extinction of unnecessary licenses. Well, I think that behind and above all these facts and arguments lies the conviction that the nation, by its Government and Parliament, is at least as responsible as brewers, distillers, and licensed victuallers are for the existence of superfluous public-houses: that the sacrifice involved in the extinction of these licenses ought not to fall entirely upon the traders whose interests would be extinguished, and that a satisfactory solution of the question cannot be arrived at by ignoring the fact that as a nation we collect from the liquor trade an annual revenue of thirty-five millions sterling.

There is an old story of two men who owned an elephant, and when they could no longer agree as to the way they would employ it, one declared that he would shoot his own half. Just as he would have damaged his partner's interests, so we should injuriously affect and depreciate the value of the buildings, plant, and stock-in-trade, which are undoubtedly the property of licensed traders, by an abrupt exercise of the nation's right to withdraw the licenses. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that licenses have been granted upon payment of annual sums far below their actual value, and that the difference between the actual annual payments and the real value represents an enormous national capital, of which the Trade monopolists

have had the benefit, but which ought to have gone to the relief of the taxpayer.

A writer on behalf of the Licensed Victuallers Central Protection Society of London, recently estimated that forty thousand licenses (which is about the number which a limit of one licensed house to each one thousand inhabitants in boroughs and one to six hundred in rural districts would produce) would, if submitted for sale by public tender, realize £100 each, or four millions per annum, and that this income, if capitalized, would probably realize a sum approaching to one hundred millions sterling. From this source an "equitable fund" may be procured from which to pay such equitable consideration as is just and necessary to secure the immediate extinction of superfluous licenses.

The promoters of various Bills now before the country all desire in some way or other to minimize the hardship of stopping the trade of a man who is getting his living in a lawful trade, and has done so perhaps for years, with probably an expense at the outset. The late Government proposed that compensation on the extinction of a license should be assessed on the basis of the difference between the value of the licensed premises immediately before the passing of the Act, and the value which such premises would have then borne if the license had been determined; and I believe that it was this excessive measure of compensation, rather than the principle of compensation itself, which was rejected by the country.

By the Local Veto Bill of the present Government it is proposed that any resolution passed in pursuance of the veto section of the Act shall not come into force before the expiration of three years from the passing of the Act—thus giving compensation in the shape of a three-years time limit; and Mr. Gladstone, in writing to a correspondent on the subject, has recently said that Parliament will, no doubt, consider whether this compensation, as regards alike its nature and extent, is adequate to the merits of the case.

Under the Manchester scheme, as recently amended, all existing licenses are to terminate at the end of five years from

the passing of the Act, whereupon a reduction in the number is to take place, and the continuing licenses are to be sold by public tender, and the proceeds applied in making compensation allowance in respect of extinguished licenses. A similar period of five years is allowed by the Westminster Bill, but if, at the first Brewster Sessions after the commencement of the Act—but not on any subsequent occasion—licenses are extinguished for the purposes of reducing the number, compensation is to be paid, and the money raised by a rate levied on the continuing licenses.

By the Church of England Temperance Society's Bill a five-years limit is also allowed, but, in order to accelerate the reduction, one-fifth of the number above the statutory limit is to be extinguished each year, and provisions are made for paying compensation during the period of five years, the necessary funds being raised by way of license-rental upon the remaining license-holders.

By the Bishop of Chester's Bill, on the establishment of an authorized Company in any district, no new license is to be granted except to the Company, and, after the expiration of five years from the date of the establishment of an authorized Company, all licenses not held by the Company are to cease. The time limit in this case therefore coincides with that suggested in the Manchester, Westminster, and Church of England Temperance Society's Bill. During the transition period, license-holders may require the Company to take over their licenses, and the compensation payable shall be the value of the interest of the persons interested in the license as settled under that Act—that is, as licenses which must expire at the expiration of five years from the authorization of the Company.

I do not think that these schemes of compensation indicate a belief that licenses are the property of the license-holders, and that they may not justly be withdrawn without compensation; but they appear to me to be evidence of a widespread conviction that, if we are to do unto others as we would they should do unto us, we ought, in withdrawing from the liquor traffic, to

minimize the hardship and loss which will fall upon those with whom the nation has at present a sort of partnership. If this be so, it is of the first importance that all who are interested in temperance should give the most careful consideration to this compensation question. The licensing justices, now, would like to see many public-houses closed, so far as the sale of intoxicating liquors are concerned, but they shrink from inflicting the consequent loss upon the license-holders. If the licensing authority be transferred either to Municipal or County Councils or to Licensing Boards elected *ad hoc*, similar reluctance will be found to exist; and if the question is left to the vote of the ratepayers, depend upon it that large numbers of conscientious voters, who are no friends of the liquor trade, will think twice before they vote for stopping the trade of their neighbour without making him some allowance with which to make a fresh start in the world. On the other hand, if some provision be made which—whilst imposing no tax or liability upon the community—will, during the short period of five years, give to publicans the means whereby to transfer themselves and their capital into other channels of trade, I believe an important step will have been taken, which will be supported by public opinion, and which will gradually but surely remedy to a large extent evils so universally deplored.

J. J. COCKSHOT.

PREDICTION AS A TEST IN POLITICAL ECONOMY.

WHEN a claim is put forward on behalf of any branch of knowledge to a place in the family of the sciences, there is one simple and decisive test by which it may be tried. Is it a branch of knowledge which has been able to explain the past, or to predict the future? If it has succeeded in doing either of these things it is entitled to the rank which it claims; if it has not done so, it must then wait until, by the more successful study, and closer investigation, of those laws of nature upon which the events, or phenomena, which fall within its province depend, it has acquired the power of explaining occurrences which have already taken place, or of foretelling those which are still to come.

That this test, although simple, is also sufficient, will hardly, I think, be disputed. Whether it is a test which political economy has completely satisfied is a point upon which, I imagine, less unanimity would be found to prevail, although, no doubt, a majority of competent persons would admit that it has done so. In order to settle this latter question I propose to bring together a few examples, in themselves familiar to all readers of this *Review*, as specimens of what political economy has accomplished in the way of explanation and prediction; and I do so in the hope of convincing some, at least, of those persons who are disposed to dispute the pretensions of political economy to scientific accuracy, that the claim is not so entirely without foundation as they are accustomed to suppose.

I. Readers of Professor Cairnes' essays on the gold trade will recollect that, prior to the Australian gold discoveries of 1851, the condition of the agricultural industries in the colony of Victoria was, and had for some time been, one of great and increasing prosperity. No sooner, however, had the discovery

of gold taken place than a blight seemed to fall upon them. Almost every kind of agricultural produce which would bear a long carriage ceased to be grown at home, and was imported from distant countries. Butter came from Ireland, timber was brought from Norway, leather, corn, etc., were imported from various countries; and this, although the colony possessed unrivalled facilities for the production of these very articles, and could have produced them for itself at less cost—that is, with less expenditure of labour and capital—than was required for their production in the countries whence they came. All those internal industries, the products of which were sufficiently portable and imperishable to be imported, languished and nearly died, while the external trade of the colony, which had previously been insignificant, was swollen to enormous dimensions. The import trades, the gold industry, and those industries which were dependent on it, alone flourished, not only absorbing all the floating labour and capital, but causing a considerable migration of those requisites of production from agriculture into the new pursuits. About the year 1854 the production of gold reached its maximum, and the richer deposits soon afterwards began to show signs of exhaustion. The order of events which I have described was then reversed. Internal trade began to revive, and imports and exports to decline. Money wages, which had more than quadrupled between 1851 and 1854, and general prices which had in the same time risen in a slightly lower proportion, began to fall. In 1856 the external trade of Victoria had reached £30,000,000 per annum. In 1870 it had fallen to £25,000,000, although the prosperity of the colony as a whole had been increasing, and agriculture steadily reviving, in the interval, wealth and population growing as foreign trade declined. During the same period money wages fell from twenty shillings to ten shillings a day.

These phenomena were, in themselves, sufficiently remarkable. But what concerns us here is this—that they had been, so to speak, hypothetically predicted by Ricardo; for the discovery by him of the Law of Comparative Cost was, I maintain, really equivalent to a prediction that a state of things, such as

I have described as following the gold discoveries, must supervene in any country in which the cost of producing any great international staple was largely reduced, other countries being at the same time debarred from producing it for themselves on equally easy terms.

It may, perhaps, be convenient here, at the risk of repeating what is familiar and elementary, briefly to state Ricardo's law. In order that a trade should spring up between two countries it is not enough that one of them should produce more cheaply than the other the commodities to be exchanged. If the advantage of that country which enjoys superior facilities for their production be equally great in the case of each article, no motive for an exchange will exist, and no trade will arise; for the profit to be derived from the trade will depend, not on the absolute, but on the comparative, costs of the articles. Thus, if cotton fabrics and wine are the subjects of a trade between England and France, the profitableness of the trade will depend, not on the fact that the cost of working up cotton goods is lower in England than in France, and the cost of growing wine lower in France than in England, but on the fact that the cost of producing wine in France is low as compared with the cost of manufacturing cotton there, and the cost of cotton low in England as compared with the cost of wine in that country. If the superiority of either country over the other in the case of both articles was equal the conditions necessary for an exchange would not exist, even though the absolute cost of the articles might be half in one country of what it was in the other.

Such is the Law of Comparative Cost which we owe to Ricardo, and which forms the keystone of the theory of international trade. Wherever a trade exists between two countries there this principle is to be found exemplified; but the most striking example of its operation has been in the case of the gold discoveries, and the reason that its operation was in that instance peculiarly striking is obviously this—that the commodity of which the cost was suddenly reduced was one for which a universal demand existed over the whole of the civilized, and a great part of the uncivilized, world, while at the same

time the nature of the case was such as to give to Australia, as compared with most other countries, a virtual monopoly in the production of it, and to preclude the greater part of the world from obtaining it by home production—a course usually open when the cost of production is reduced by the progress of invention. It was, I believe, no uncommon thing, in the early days of Australian gold mining, to see Norwegian timber used for mining and building in the vicinity of forests which would have supplied unlimited material for those purposes, and which had been used for them not long before. The effect of cheap gold was to make it cheaper to dig for gold and purchase trees from Europe, than to cut and prepare those which grew on the spot. Ricardo has been called a dreamer; I can only say that in his visions he foresaw the future, and dreamed eternal truths.

II. I now turn to another example of the power of prediction which a knowledge of economic laws enables its possessor to exercise. Perhaps no economic principle is less open to dispute than this—that the value of a country's imports must, in the long run, equal that of its exports.

“The produce of a country exchanges,” says Mr. Mill, “for the produce of other countries at such values as are required in order that the whole of her imports may exactly pay for the whole of her exports.”

The moment the balance is disturbed forces come into play which, acting through the delicate mechanism of the foreign exchanges, tend to restore it, and to maintain the commercial equilibrium. When, however, a nation is so circumstanced that, in addition to the ordinary trade balance, she has to make to other countries, or is entitled to receive from them, payments in the nature of a tribute, there arises an apparent, but only an apparent, exception to the rule. Let us take the case of England. London has long been the commercial and banking metropolis of the civilized world. Of the large sum annually saved in England a considerable part seeks investment abroad, while the amount of foreign capital which comes to England for investment is relatively insignificant. The interest therefore payable to England by foreign countries forms a large annual

tribute flowing into the country—a debt due from the outside world, over and above that other debt which is due for commodities exported and services rendered. The trade returns accordingly show that the value of English exports is largely exceeded by that of the imports, the difference representing the sum which comes to us in discharge of financial, as distinguished from commercial, liabilities, including under the latter head the sum due to us for what have been termed invisible exports, or services rendered by us to other nations. The outside world owes us a financial debt and a commercial one, and our imports represent the sum of the two.

Now, the position of the United States during the interval between the civil war and the crisis of 1873 was the exact converse of England. The failure of the cotton crop was one result of the war; the contraction of a large external debt was another. The capital sum which Europe advanced to America on foot of the loan was never actually paid, but was liquidated by setting off against it the vast debt, on commercial account, which America, owing to the failure of the cotton crop, became unable to pay to Europe, and the very remarkable state of things which supervened was this. The cotton trade was slowly recovering, an enormous American debt was held in Europe and was bearing interest, and yet the condition of trade was such that exports, instead of exceeding imports, fell far short of them; whereas, in order that the United States should discharge all her foreign liabilities, it was essential that the value of the exports should exceed that of the imports by an amount equal to the interest on the external debt. How, then, it will be asked, was the national solvency maintained, and the interest on the foreign loans provided for? An expedient was resorted to which, from its nature, could only serve the purpose of postponing for a time the evil day. American securities were largely sold in European markets, thus adding to the existing amount of foreign liabilities, and with the proceeds of these sales the interest as it accrued was paid. This, as I have said, was obviously a temporary expedient; for, not only did it provide no permanent means of preserving the national solvency, but it

swelled the annual deficit. The one condition of solvency was that the exports should be made to exceed the imports by the amount of the financial liability of the country to other countries, and yet the actual state of things was the reverse of this. Founding his opinion on these facts, Professor Cairnes, writing some time before the crisis of 1873, ventured a prediction to which I now invite attention as a remarkable instance of a man foreseeing from an intellectual eminence the approach of events which were wholly invisible to the persons whose fate depended on them, and who were absolutely unconscious of their approach. I give Professor Cairnes's prophecy in his own words:—

“These considerations lead me to the conclusion that the present state of the external trade of the United States is essentially abnormal and temporary. If that country is to continue to discharge its liabilities to foreigners, the relation which obtains at present between exports and imports in her external trade must be inverted. Her exports must once again, as previous to 1860, be made to exceed her imports, and this by an amount greater than the excess of that former time in proportion as her financial obligations to other countries have in the interval increased. This, it seems to me, is a result which may be predicted with the utmost confidence. The end may be reached either by an extension of exportation, or by a curtailment of importation, or by combining both these processes, but, by one means or another, reached it will need to be. It is simply the condition of her remaining a solvent nation. The people of that country may, therefore, if I am right in this speculation, look forward to witnessing a result for which the promoters of their present commercial policy have often sighed—they may expect, before many years, to see United States commodities selling in foreign countries in vastly greater quantities than the commodities of foreign countries in the markets of the United States. . . . The conclusion just stated suggests a further reflection. A change in the relation of exports and imports in the trade of a country can only be effected through a change in relative prices (measured in gold or silver) as they exist in that country and in those with which it trades. To establish, therefore, an excess of exports over imports in the trade of the United States, in lieu of the balance the other way which now exists, prices there must be lowered in relation to prices in Europe. This may be accomplished partly by an advance in prices here, not shared by the United States, as in fact has already happened

in the case of some important commodities ; but it is probable that the end will be reached mainly through a decline of prices on the other side. A considerable fall of general prices, however, is a remedy to which manufacturers and merchants will only submit when pushed to extremity. It will therefore only come when credit has been strained to the utmost, and a catastrophe is seen to be inevitable ; and then it will probably come with a crash. For these reasons I should be disposed to look forward to the immediate future of American trade as a period of much disturbance and fluctuation, culminating, possibly, from time to time in commercial crises."

It is full of interest and instruction to contrast this clear and reasoned forecast with similar attempts, made about the same time, by an order of men who affect a contempt for the theoretical economist, who would have classed Cairnes with Ricardo as a dreamer, and who think that a perfect mastery of economic problems is to be reached by a life spent in a counting-house, or on 'change, and in watching those financial barometers—very valuable, no doubt, in their way—the bank rate and the foreign exchanges. As Cairnes was writing the above passage, the protectionist financiers of New York were anticipating a flow of gold from Europe, and a rise of prices in the United States! "The tide of Gold," wrote the *New York Journal of Commerce*, "must flow towards America, and the sovereigns of Great Britain will melt their pride in the crucibles of the American mint." By writers of this class the crisis of 1873 was, and for all I know, still is, attributed to the railway mania which preceded it. That the catastrophe was precipitated, and materially aggravated, by that cause, I freely admit ; but that it was wholly, or even mainly, due to it will hardly be maintained by any one who appreciates the force of the above facts and of the reasoning which Cairnes founded on them, and who considers that the construction of railways, so far from being arrested by the crisis, still went on at a rate of two thousand miles a year. The duration of the commercial depression which followed the crisis confirms the conclusion that it had its root in causes of a deeper and more permanent character than railway speculation.

III. The next example which I propose to take, as affording

a convincing verification of economic principles, is one in which events were not, so far as I am aware, predicted, but in which they were, immediately on their occurrence, explained in such a way as to make it certain that if, before their occurrence, the data then available had been laid before a competent observer, he could have predicted the result. Regarded as a test, explanation of this kind is only another name for prediction, inasmuch as the verification of principles which it supplies is precisely the same.

When France emerged, bleeding and prostrate, from her struggle with Germany, it seemed to most persons that, not only had her military pride been humbled, but that her industrial energies had been so crushed and crippled that she would require years, if not generations, to recover. The country had been overrun by hostile armies, production had been suspended, property destroyed, an inconvertible currency had taken the place of the precious metals, a large tract of territory had been annexed by the victorious power, and an apparently ruinous fine imposed on the vanquished one. Could any one unacquainted with economic doctrine, and with one fact in the condition of France at that time which I am about to mention, have supposed that she would, at the close of a few years, have outstripped her rival in the industrial race. The fact to which I allude is this: previous to the war of 1870, a banking system can hardly be said to have existed in France. The peasantry were among the most thrifty in Europe, but they had not yet learned to trust banks, or public companies, or even Governments, with their savings. The French peasant looked on his farm as his bank, and that part of his savings which he could not profitably sink in it, he buried in the floor, or in the wall, of his cottage. Credit, and instruments of credit, were little used, and the benefits of "lending and borrowing upon advantage" were but little known. "Neither a borrower nor a lender be," may have been sound enough advice from Polonius to Laertes, but a nation which adopts it as a commercial maxim will be left behind in the race of industrial competition. Credit, according to the proverb, is to commerce what wings are to a bird. The

benefits of lending and borrowing are in fact the same as those which arise in the case of all exchanges. One man has what another man wants, and wants what that other has. They exchange, and the sum of utility is greater than before. Of two countries, equal in other respects, that one which makes a more extensive use of legitimate credit than the other will be the more prosperous, because the existing capital will be rendered more effective by passing into the hands of persons who make a more efficient use of it than the lenders, and the result will be a gain to the productive powers of the country.

It is therefore clear that any event which effected a change in the hoarding habits of the French people, would, so far as it tended to produce that result, have been a blessing, though it might come disguised as a disaster, and this change the payment of the war indemnity helped to bring about. It became a point of honour and patriotism with the French peasant to draw forth his hoarded gold, to subscribe to the indemnity loan, and so shorten the period of military occupation. His position was improved, for his treasure was at least as safe as when it lay hidden in the wall of his cottage, and he now received interest for it. The taxpayer, it is true, had to pay the interest; but the country, as a whole, lost nothing, for the taxes (so far as they went to pay that large part of the loan which was subscribed by the peasantry) were simply taken from one set of Frenchmen, and paid over to another whose capital had before lain idle. A habit of trusting other people with their money was thus encouraged, and the prompt return to specie payments created a confidence in instruments of credit. A bank note, however convertible, had up to this time reminded a Frenchman of an assignat, and he regarded one with a very natural suspicion.

Paradoxical, therefore, as the assertion may seem, it is certain that the exaction of the war indemnity was, under the peculiar circumstances in which she was placed, a benefit, as well as an injury, to France; while Germany was perhaps more injured than benefited by receiving it. The influx of gold produced an inflation which the mercantile classes mistook for a rise of prices proceeding from other causes, and a period of speculation set in

which terminated in a commercial crisis. It was, I believe, the suggestion of a German writer that, in the event of another German victory such as that of 1871, the French should be forced to accept an indemnity from their conquerors.

The rapidity with which countries devastated by war recover from the effects of it is an economic commonplace. The explanation is given in the current text-books, and need not be repeated here. One other circumstance, however, in the condition of France, besides that above referred to, which contributed to the result has been little dwelt on. The greater part of her industries are agricultural, and in agriculture the amount of fixed capital in proportion to the total amount of capital employed is small, and the amount of circulating capital large; while in most manufacturing industries the proportion which fixed capital bears to circulating is very considerable. It follows that an agricultural country suffers less than a manufacturing one from an invasion, since it contains less destructible capital. If the events of 1870-71 had occurred in England, it is probable that the effects would have been more disastrous and the recovery a slower process; and this for two reasons: first, more fixed capital would have been injured and destroyed, and, secondly, the money to pay the indemnity would, in a great degree, have come, not from an unproductive hoard, but from capital devoted to, or savings about to be devoted to, productive purposes. The breach in the national capital would have been greater, and the period of depression which followed would have been of corresponding duration. Another cause which would, in most manufacturing countries, though perhaps not in England owing to her command of the sea, have helped to aggravate the situation, is this: the supply from abroad of the raw material of manufactures would have been stopped during the war, and the loss arising from arrested production would have been greater than in France, in which the loss from this cause was probably insignificant.

I have, I think, said enough to show that the sequel to the war of 1870 furnishes a striking confirmation of the portion of economic doctrine which bears upon it. Some of the factors in

the case were of that kind which exist in all countries which have been swept by a wave of war. Others, especially those connected with the indemnity, were exceptional and peculiar to the particular case. With regard to both, the verification of economic principles has been most complete and conclusive.

IV. I have claimed for Ricardo the credit of having, in substance, predicted the immediate results of the gold discoveries. To Cairnes is due the honour of having, not in substance merely, but in the most minute detail, predicted their remote consequences. He was, I believe, the first writer to subvert the erroneous, and once prevalent, opinion that the action of an increased supply of money upon its value is uniform, and affects all commodities at once and in the same degree. He pointed out that, although the ultimate effect of a new money supply may be to affect all prices equally, yet, during a period of progressive depreciation, such as that which followed the gold discoveries, the prices of commodities are affected in the order in which the new demand falls on them. He predicted that the rise of prices which had already manifested itself in the gold countries would next affect those countries which, like England and America, were in immediate commercial contact with them; and that, in these latter countries, the classes which ministered, as producers, to the wants of the gold countries would be the first to feel, in advancing wages, the effects of what Bagehot has called the "travelling depreciation," and that, consequently, the prices of the articles which entered most largely into the consumption of those classes would be first struck by the advancing wave. Nor did he stop here. He went on to show that, all other conditions being the same, the rise of prices would be greatest in those countries whose currencies were most susceptible to the new influence on account of their possessing a large superstructure of credit resting on a relatively small hard money foundation, and that countries such as India, China, and other Asiatic communities, in which banking facilities and credit expedients were but slightly developed, which did not directly, or largely, minister to the wants of the gold countries, and which were

not in close commercial contact with them, would be the last to be touched by the wave. He further pointed out that, as some classes of commodities would rise in price before others, owing to their suitability to the wants of the gold countries, and to the wants of those who, in other countries, produced what the gold countries consumed, so these articles themselves would not, *inter se*, rise *pari passu*, but would be more or less affected according as, from their nature, they admitted of having their supply quickly augmented or diminished in accordance with demand; and that, therefore, articles of finished manufacture, although their price might at first rise rapidly, would not long continue in advance of the general movement—that raw products consumed by the productive classes, not being capable of having their supply quickly increased, would remain for some time at an advanced price, and that this would be more marked in the case of animal, than in the case of vegetable products, and that the effects of the new money would last be felt by articles of finished manufacture not consumed by the productive classes.

Now these predictions were not of the ambiguous and general kind in which the crafty man indulges. *Dolus versatur in generalibus*. They were minutely specific, and extended at the same time to such a variety of particulars as to exclude all possibility of their fulfilment being due to chance; and that they were fulfilled, except where a distinct disturbing cause, competent to affect the result, intervened to modify it, is now a matter of history. The principal disturbing influences were of a kind which could not, when the essays were published, have been foreseen, but which, if foreseen, could have been allowed for, so as to bring the forecast into exact accordance with the result. For example, the American civil war, by causing a temporary failure of the cotton supply, and leading to the emission of an inconvertible currency and a large increase of taxation, modified very considerably the course of economic events in the United States, and, by throwing the English demand for cotton upon India, accelerated the movement of the precious metals towards that country; while the failure

of the European silk crop had a somewhat similar effect as regards China. Allowing for these disturbances, the result of Cairnes's forecast affords a proof of the scientific character of the principles on which it is founded quite as decisive as that supplied, in the case of astronomy, by the calculation in which Adams and Le Verrier deduced from the perturbations of the planet Uranus the exact position in the heavens of the unknown body whose presence was causing them—a calculation which, I need hardly say, resulted in the discovery of the planet Neptune in the predicted spot. Not that I mean by this illustration to imply that political economy can lay claim to the precision of an exact science. What I do insist on is this, that the verification of the economic forecasts has been quite as decisive of the genuinely scientific character of the principles on which they were founded as the triumphs of modern astronomy are with respect to that science.

WILLIAM D. McDONNELL.

ADULTERATIONS IN GROCERIES.

WE all know the proverbial anecdote of the grocer who requests his assistant to come to prayers after finishing off various adulterations, ending with sanding the sugar. What may have been the case generations ago it is not possible to say, but, nowadays, nothing less representative than this tale could well be conceived. The retail grocer, if he wanted ever so much to do so, and, as a matter of fact, he does not want, could not adulterate with sufficient skill to avoid detection. It is true that this class of shopkeeper is often enough punished for adulteration, but, in nine cases out of ten, he is not the real culprit, who is to be found rather in the ranks of the wholesale manufacturers or preparers of goods for sale. The bulk of the cases also are on the borderland of adulteration proper, and have to do with so-called "admixtures," which have been half recognized by the law, but in which it is easy to set a trap for the retail seller, because, from the extent of the trades in question, the commodities get names popularly attached to them to which they are not properly entitled. The so-called prepared cocoa with its mixtures of various starches and sugar, mustard mollified by flour and coloured by tumeric, and coffee spoilt by chicory—are the substances about which the bulk of the prosecutions against retail grocers are brought under the Sale of Foods Act, by which euphemistic title the law as to adulteration is known. None of these goods, with the exception, to a small degree, of coffee, are prepared by the retailer. Under the law, the wholesale manufacturer is sufficiently protected if he places on the packets a general declaration, often in small type, of the fact that the commodity in question is admixed with other substances. In addition to selling "admixed" mustard, or cocoa, or coffee, in

sealed packets, the manufacturers sell large quantities in bulk. With these more wholesale lots labels are supplied for the retailer to affix at the time of sale; but, generally through carelessness or ignorance, though sometimes by fraud, these labels are not put on, thus leading to prosecutions and convictions. Almost all the cases in the grocery trade, in which the provision trade is not here included, come under these heads.

Undoubtedly these admixtures were, in most cases, originally adulterations, but the practice in connection with them is well known, and large trades have been built up in them under the connivance and even the tacit assistance of the law. The commodities in question thus occupy a somewhat different position to others to be treated of later on. It is generally seen, however, that the law is at present in a most unsatisfactory state. There is no limit to the amount of starch, sugar, flour, or chicory that may be admixed respectively with cocoa, mustard, and coffee, and a simple general declaration of admixture may cover the addition of as little as five per cent., or as much as ninety-five per cent., of a foreign substance. In this way an unscrupulous manufacturer, especially if he does not sell at a proportionate price, may commit a virtual fraud upon the purchaser. The law undoubtedly requires to be greatly strengthened. If the foreign commodities named are advantageous, the more widely their exact proportion is known the more the manufacturer would benefit. If the additions are, as we believe, by no means so advantageous as the manufacturers assert, then it is the public that ought to be told how much starch, or flour, or chicory they are eating or drinking, when they think they are consuming something else. In addition to this, it is quite clear, from a moral point of view, that cocoa, or mustard, or coffee, containing more than a given proportion of other things, ought not to be sold as cocoa, etc., at all, but should always be sold under some quite different name. To this the makers reply that the trade has long been in a semi-legalized position, and that large interests have grown up under the tacit toleration of Government, so that suddenly

to compel an alteration, and insist upon things not being sold under misleading titles, would be unjust. When, however, it is a question whether the public should or should not be subjected to risks of practical frauds, there can only be one answer. Besides, flour and mustard sold under such a name as "mustardette," and the other goods under a similar alteration in title, would very likely command quite as good a sale as they did when sold under a misleading name. If not, the sale of the unmixed mustard, etc., would increase in proportion as the sale of the "admixture" diminished, and the makers would gain on the one hand what they lost on the other.

The manufacturers object to declaring the proportions of these admixtures, on the ground that their publication would be a declaration of trade secrets; but this is by no means the case. Every one knows with what substances the goods are admixed, and their proportion cannot be a question which can be regarded as a matter which the manufacturers are entitled to keep to themselves, as if there were secret ability or virtue in the recipe. On the contrary, the public are entitled to know what proportion of alien things they are eating, so as to be enabled to protect themselves in the price they pay. Another point that is raised by the manufacturers is, that no declaration of the proportion of foreign matters would enable the public to judge the value of the raw mustard, or cocoa, or coffee used as the foundation for the mixture. The public as a whole are, however, pretty shrewd judges in such matters, and, after all, it is better for them to have the main point which they want to know declared to them, and that is, how much flour, etc., their mustard or other mixtures contain. A more serious objection is the fact that the analysts cannot, at present, accurately check the declarations of proportions in admixtures; but, surely, it is better that a clue should be given by the declaration of the manufacturer, than that the analyst should be left to grope in the dark, as he now is.

Turning from these "admixtures" to what all regard as adulterations, the grocery trade, in its heavier branches, is

fairly free, as a whole, from such offences. Tea, contrary to popular idea, has not been really adulterated in living memory. It is true that certain teas used to be so heavily coloured with paint by the Chinese as to really amount to adulteration, and that other teas were mixed by them with a certain proportion of iron filings. The object of the first operation was to pass off inferior green tea for the fine article, which is still coloured with a minute proportion of Prussian blue and gypsum. The object of the filings was not to add to weight fraudulently, but for the iron to combine with the tannin in the leaf, and thus to give the deep black liquor delighted in by our old women. Both these abuses have been stopped since the power of examining tea on import was given to the Customs authorities. This suggests a proper and much-needed extension of the law, namely, that all imported commodities should be liable to inspection, in the public interest, in the ship or on the import wharf, and that all wholesale warehouses and factories should be liable to the visits of inspectors and to fines and seizures, before the goods reach the shops at all.

Sugar, if it ever was adulterated, is not so now. In fact, it is too cheap to be capable of much adulteration. The prosecutions of retailers for the sale of yellow British refiners' crystals as "Demeraras" comes under another category, namely, that of a false trade description. In dried fruits, the familiar constituents of the cake, the bun, or the pudding, adulteration is impossible, and the same may be said of rice and other grains. Farinaceous substances are sometimes mixed together and sold under a false name wholesale, but this offence is not a common one. In seeds, exhausted carraways, from which the valuable essential oil has been expressed, are often mixed off with unexhausted seeds, either abroad or here; and the same is believed to be true of linseed. If the skill of analysts were sufficient, these frauds could probably be readily dealt with under the present law.

Spices open up a wider field for adulteration, and one that is unhappily still largely utilized by fraudulent traders. Pepper has always been a favourite with the sophisticator, and offences

have been far more common since the excise control was abolished on the removal of the duty. There is a good deal of excuse for the appearance of a certain amount of actual dirt in ground pepper, because the corrugation of the corns, which are dried on the earth in the open air, takes up in many cases a great deal of earth, which it is practically impossible to remove. This difficulty should be met by the seizure on import of any parcels containing more than a fixed proportion of dirt. This would enforce greater caution on the Chinese and Malay growers. Apart from this, pepper is often directly adulterated by the grinders and others in this country. A short time back the so-called "long pepper" was largely mixed, and palmed off on the grocers as white pepper. The two substances have absolutely no likeness or connection, and fortunately this fraud was stopped on its being made known to the retailers that the mixture could be detected by the application of a little heat, when "long" pepper gives off an offensive smell. Another substance used in adulterating pepper is ground rice, but this far too common fraud is easily found out by the microscope. Then follows a practice which, carried to excess, is a fraud, though up to a certain degree it is quite allowable, though what that degree is should be fixed by law. The difference between black and white pepper is that the former includes the natural husk of the corns, which is removed in the latter, leaving only the grey or whitish kernel. This can be readily seen by cutting a black pepper-corn open with a knife. The white pepper, of course, costs much more, but it is a question whether the cheaper black and entire corn is not really better and more pungent. Still, as the public have a fancy that the white pepper, being more costly, is the best, there is no harm in the taste being indulged. Formerly the husks were always removed when the berries were fresh (it will not do to say when they are green, for they are red); but of late years it has been found that a prettier-looking white pepper has been produced by removing the husks from the dried corns by suitable machinery in this country. The husks are cracked off and sifted out, and the white kernel left. To this there is no objection, any more than to the

removal of bran from flour. The question then arises of what is to be done with the husks, and the too-frequent solution is to mix them off with other black peppers in grinding. In some cases even half husks and half pepper are sold as "pepper," which practice appears to more scrupulous traders as a fraud. This question, however, admits of considerable palliation or excuse, for the husks are certainly pungent, and have a value of their own. This is one of the points in which Government should intervene and fix a standard. Otherwise it might be held that even in black pepper all the husks ought to be sifted out in grinding. Passing from this point, there was a few years ago a fraud extensively practised with black pepper. A substance christened, or rather miscalled, "poivrette," which was absolutely worthless, and consisted of ground olive stones, was added on a large scale to black pepper. The leading members of the trade in vain invoked the assistance of the analysts, who avowed themselves unable to detect the fraud, and to distinguish between the genuine and the adulterated pepper. After some time a well-known Liverpool analyst found out a means of detection, and the fraud was put an end to. The remedy, however, was an unjust one. Small retailers in back streets, who had bought the adulterated pepper in good faith, were punished, while the real offenders, the grinders, who had made thousands of pounds by their robberies, remained unpunished, though they were perfectly well known to the whole trade. There is a strong suspicion that black pepper is at the present moment being extensively adulterated with some foreign substance, probably some portion of the meal of an Indian grain, which the analysts cannot yet detect. Samples have recently been submitted as to the adulteration of which there can be little doubt, but science is not as yet advanced enough to find out the fraud. Here, again, the adulteration is committed wholesale, and could probably be stopped if there were a proper system of inspecting wholesale places.

Another fraud which is going on to a heavy extent is also a wholesale offence, and that is the admixture of "spent" with whole ginger, and the sale of the deteriorated compound simply

as ginger. This fraud is carried to such an extent as to be a most serious inroad on the trade of the honest ginger-grinder, and it is openly defended by the offenders, who are perfectly well known, but are left untouched, while, after a long delay, a few of the retailers of the partially spent ginger have been punished, though they produced warranties of genuineness from the real offenders, and were undoubtedly acting in good faith. The delay in the commencement of action by the analysts was due to their being unable for some time to detect the fraud, and indeed their means of detection are even yet not what they should be. It should be explained that "spent" ginger is the refuse left after the fermentation of the root in ginger-beer making, or after its exhaustion in cordial making. This fraud could be readily stopped by a system of wholesale inspection, and it is a disgrace to our jurisprudence that it should go on almost unchecked, and that the value of a fine aromatic cordial and stomachic like ginger should be allowed to be lessened by such frauds.

Other offences in the spice trade are the use of substances that are not spices in "mixed spice," and the undeclared use of "wild" mace and nutmegs, which are comparatively valueless, if not wholly so, in the place of the nutmegs and mace of commerce. Both these practices would be stopped by the inspection of wholesale premises. A substance generally sold in the spice trade, though it is really a natural sugar, is liquorice. Here an abuse prevails which would be readily checked under any proper adulteration law. A great deal of spurious liquorice is made in France, and under the French law each stick has to be stamped with "70" or other figures showing the proportion of adulteration. This liquorice is allowed to be freely sold in this country without any declaration, and, as it is not soluble (as the true juice of the liquorice plant is, when made up properly in the best Italian brands), its sale materially injures the demand for a valuable demulcent. In addition to this, a sapient Metropolitan magistrate has recently decided that, while a chemist when asked for liquorice must sell it, a confectioner need not do so, but may legally offer a relatively worthless

compound called liquorice pipe, thus further causing a quite illegitimate though legal competition with liquorice proper.

It will be seen from the above that, while what are known as "heavy" groceries are not adulterated, there is a great deal of adulteration in minor and very valuable articles; while the law, both as to so-called admixtures and in many other respects, greatly wants strengthening, and nearly always against wholesale offenders. In fact, nothing effectual can be done until the law is extended and improved. The following are some points requiring attention :—

1. A better definition of adulteration: for instance, it has been held that, as baking-powder is not a food, it may be adulterated with alum.

2. Packed goods offered to the public as they left the manufacturer should constitute a warranty: that is, the manufacturer and not the retailer should be proceeded against. "Warranties" with goods in bulk present great if not insuperable difficulties.

3. Wholesale warehouses and factories, wharves, ships, sale-rooms, etc., should all be brought under the supervision of the adulteration inspectors.

4. Admixed goods should have the proportion of admixtures legibly declared upon the packets: beyond a certain proportion of foreign admixture the use of such names as mustard, cocoa or coffee should not be allowed.

5. A Government department should be formed for the supervision and instruction of analysts, and for the fixing and varying from time to time of the standards of purity. The inspectors should be appointed by some central authority, and not be under the control of small bodies like vestries, etc.

As the law now stands it is far too frequently quite futile in the way of preventing adulteration; while, if it is of any use, it too often acts by striking the wrong person, and by punishing the small retailer who is really innocent and does not profit by the fraud, while the real and often wealthy offender is allowed to go scot-free. Further, the absence of any fund for promoting analytical researches is a fatal bar to progress in securing greater purity in food, while failing investigation into such matters at

the cost of the public gross frauds are allowed to go on both in groceries and in provisions, to the injury of the honest trader, farmer, or agriculturist, as well as to the detriment of the public. As showing the imperfections of the existing law, it is to be specially noted that the whole of the adulterations (as distinct from admixtures) named above, have come into being since the Sale of Foods Acts came into force. The attention of manufacturers was directed to the subject by the public discussions upon it. They found how easy it was to defeat the law and how profitable an operation it was to do so. It is further to be noted that, without the active assistance of several of the older members of the trade, hardly any of the frauds in question would have been dealt with. This is surely a very unsatisfactory state of things, and one urgently demanding a remedy. The petty pickpocket who steals a handkerchief is infinitely less of an enemy to society than the man who systematically robs by wholesale.

A WHOLESALE TRADER.

IS THE INDIVIDUALIST OR THE COLLECTIVIST VIEW OF SOCIAL PROGRESS MORE IN ACCORD- ANCE WITH THE TEACHING OF CHRIST?

THE subject indicated by our title is a very wide and a very important one: wide, inasmuch as the term Social Progress covers the whole field of our complex and varied civilization; important, inasmuch as upon the answer given to the question by the Church of the Christ depends at least the immediate and near future of her life and influence in the world, depends whether she will succeed in her mission or fail to accomplish her lofty enterprise.

It may be well to begin by defining precisely the senses in which the terms employed in the question will be used in the present paper. By Individualism we mean that view of progress which centres its operations upon the individual life and character, leaving the character so formed to amend, so far as possible, its own environment, which minimizes the action of external forces, which works from the centre to the circumference, believing in the perfection of the individual life, not only for its own sake, but for the sake of the whole family, as the great goal to be aimed at and reached.

By Collectivism we mean that view of progress which seeks to elevate whole communities of men and women by united action upon them, not by way of producing individual conviction, but by means of external pressure of various kinds; which pays large and almost exclusive attention to questions of environment, which believes in man rather than in men, as the object of its care, and which has for its aim the furtherance of "causes" rather than the uplifting of units.

By the teaching of Christ, we mean not only His isolated words, but the main drift and purpose of His doctrine, and that

as expressed, not only in speech, but in action. It is quite possible to find isolated sayings of our Lord which make for Individualism, and to set over against these other sayings which imply a regard for a wider unity and for corporate action: it is quite possible to treat the sayings apart from the life, and the life apart from the teaching. But such treatment of the teaching of Christ is neither theologically sound nor scientifically justifiable. The true method in theology, as elsewhere, is the historical, viz. to take a minute survey of all the facts, and then to draw the inevitable inference.

It would, of course, be impossible within the limits of a brief paper to even summarily state what the facts are. We must take them to a large extent for granted as known, and endeavour to deal with the principles that appear to us to be involved in them, leaving it for others to state whether or no such inferences as we may draw are inevitable and therefore true.

I wish, also, for the sake of clearness and force, to indicate, side by side with the method of the Christ, the method of the State in dealing with social progress, because the points of difference will serve to bring out the true nature of the issue, and lead at the close of the paper to what I consider to be a valuable distinction. And for practical purposes, moreover, it does not matter whether we contrast with the Christian method the politics of contemporary Palestine or Rome, or employ the State machinery of our own day by way of illustration. It may be more convenient to follow the latter course, since the facts and methods of our own time are likely to be better known than those of Judaism or pagan Rome.

In studying the life-history of any organism from its earliest inception to its final dissolution, there are two fundamental facts discernible, not isolated or capable of isolation, but related and perpetually acting and reacting upon each other. These are, first, the germ, and secondly, the environment. The progress of the life of the organism depends partly on the germ and partly on the environment in which it finds itself. A sound, healthy, vigorous germ can overcome sundry defects in the environment, so long as these defects are not so serious as

to be fatal to its existence. And, again, a modification of the environment may enable a feeble and imperfectly vitalized germ to struggle to a fuller life than would otherwise have been possible. It would be interesting and instructive to illustrate this from biological science, but we must confine our attention to such elucidations of the principle as can be gathered from social science only, since there it reaches its highest form of manifestation, and since, moreover, the method of analogy is sometimes misleading, and I have no wish to emulate the brilliant failures of Professor Drummond in this sphere.

The fact, then, before us, as before the mind of every man who has ever looked or ever will look upon the life-history of his own character, or pondered over "the riddle of the painful earth" round about him, is Man, the germ—not man as an isolated or separated unit, but man with an environment, and with an environment of a very varied and complex character, an environment that may be roughly divided in a twofold manner. Internal: his physical body with its advantages and drawbacks; his inherited and acquired tendencies, physical, mental, emotional, ethical, and spiritual; his habits, more or less fixed according to the strength of their nature and the term of their existence. External: the time when and the place where he lives; the civilization of which he forms a part; the social order into which he has been born; the house he lives in; the food he eats; the water (or whatever it is) he drinks; the money he earns; the family life which surrounds him as a help or as a hindrance; the friendships he contracts; the books and newspapers he reads; the political party to which he belongs; the amusements he frequents; the Church into which he has been baptised;—all these constitute his external environment. They are not independent of him, since he enters into and forms part of their life, which is a larger one than his own. He is not independent of them, since he cannot live his life apart from them. They act on him consciously and unconsciously. He, in turn, reacts on them, both intelligently and also without any conscious volition. He can, to a certain extent, modify the conditions of his life by changing his dwelling-place, his food,

his drink, his companions, his politics, his reading, his Church, though, how slightly, was long ago expressed well by Horace—

“Coelum, non animum mutant, qui trans mare currunt ;
 quod petis hic est.”

The environment can, again, to a certain extent, modify the man by moulding his character, by intensifying or diminishing the strength of his habits, by widening or narrowing the sphere of his action. Deprive the man of his environment and he dies. Deprive the environment of the man, and, to the extent to which it depends on him for its vitality—and this, of course, varies with each individual case—it suffers loss, both in quantity and energy.

This division of the life-history of a human being into germ and environment, under different names in different ages, has attracted the attention of all reformers, and has influenced their mode of procedure. No one has ever regarded the world seriously without at once perceiving the necessity for some kind of reformation. Even the most shallow optimist—if such exist—has occasionally found fault with his dinner or with the colour of his wall paper, and to that extent has modified or attempted to modify his environment. Or, if the deficiencies of his domestic arrangements or the gradually deepening colour of his ceiling have caused him a temporary aberration from moral serenity in the form of an ebullition of splenetic venom, he has, if wise, determined to amend himself. But serious men have regarded improvement in some form or other to be the main object of their life here, and the only question with them has been, What improvement? Shall it take the form of a modification of the conditions of life, or that of the renovation of the individual man? Shall it be the programme of John Wesley, or that of the London County Council?

Broadly speaking, statesmen have chosen the latter method of reform, religious men the former, as of prior value and importance. In two epochs of the history of the Church particularly the two have been seen in partial combination, in the Middle Ages, and in our own day. The result of the experiment of the

Middle Ages was the Reformation, which was substantially, from this point of view, a return to the Individualist method of Church work. What the result of the experiment of our own time will be, history must show. The new method differs in some very important particulars from that of the Church of the Middle Ages, but at its root it is identical with it. I am, of course, only dealing with fundamental principles, and I am perfectly conscious of large modifications that would have to be taken into account if details were considered. It would also be necessary in a full review of the question to take notice of how much of this spirit was due to the following of the Christ, and how much to the influence of the ages that succeeded the personal presence of the Lord upon the earth; how far, *e.g.*, St. Paul may be regarded as responsible for the adoption of the Collectivist method, and how remarkable it is that many portions of his teaching that are based upon it are to all intents and purposes now disregarded. I cannot stay to consider how far such particular instances were or were not the legitimate outcome of the teaching of the Christ, but merely mention the fact to show that the point has not been overlooked. I pass at once to the vital issue, the relation of the teaching of St. Paul's Master and ours to the question of social reform.

And here I have no hesitation in stating that, taking the teaching of Christ in the sense in which I defined it at the outset, *viz.* as including all His sayings and all His life, His words and His deeds, that He deliberately chose and followed the Individualist method as the best means of achieving the Collectivist ideal. To save the world, He would begin by saving the individual men and women who compose it. He dealt with individuals and not with communities. He influenced men directly and not indirectly. He left environment severely and ruthlessly alone. Social questions He did not meddle with, and, when they were brought before Him, He refused to have anything to do with them. He would feed a hungry multitude—twice only in the course of His ministry,—but He did so for the sake of the spiritual teaching which followed, and which might perchance influence an individual life here and there,

which is all that it can have done, as is clear from the occurrence of the teaching in St. John's Gospel alone, and from its evidently deterrent effect upon some of those who heard it. But, we may note in passing, that while He fed the multitude He did not trust them, and most certainly did not commit to them the government of His Church. He was content to spend a large part of His brief ministry in "the training of the Twelve," in the formation and development of their lives and characters, in the storing up in them of spiritual energy, in the formation in them of a nucleus or germ which should by-and-by, like the germ-grain of mustard-seed, grow into a mighty tree. He was content to heal such individual cases of disease as were brought before Him, to heal them one by one, and then only where the essential condition of trust was present in the sufferers or in those who brought them, for sometimes even He could not do many mighty works because of want of trust. There was no wholesale treatment of human suffering, no dispensing of a universal drug warranted to cure all kinds of disease. But there was a patient, personal treatment of individual cases, by methods varying with the characters and needs of the patients; and if the cases were sometimes numerous there was no variation in His mode of procedure. The long eastern day had lengthened into the shadows of the evening time ere He had healed them every one.

And when, to take typical instances, men tried to cause Him to deviate from such a method, He resolutely and sternly refused. When Nicodemus came to Him, willing to acknowledge Him as a Divine teacher and miracle worker, possibly as an elder man to advise Him as to the best way of achieving His mission, and regarding Him doubtless as a second Elijah or Jeremiah, the Christ, by a transition of subject that seems abrupt unless so interpreted, almost repudiated such a description of His work as Nicodemus had given. "I am not only or mainly a teacher. I am not only or mainly a worker of signs and wonders. My work is to implant a new life in man, to create a new type of existence, a life born from above. I am come that they might have life, or, if life exist, that they

might have fuller and deeper life. And so, except a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God." And no one yet has ventured to describe birth as anything but a purely individualist act, though it is not without its influence upon the larger life of the world.

Or, again, when a discontented or aggrieved brother came to Him to suggest and intreat His interference in a family dispute concerning property, He repudiated any such kind of action as belonging to His work in the world. "Who made Me a ruler or a judge over thee?" Not because He regarded the man as wrong in wanting a moiety of the inheritance, regardless of the supposed equal claim of others to the same property. Such a notion of the division of property was utterly foreign to the ideas of the time, would have been unintelligible if it had been stated; and, moreover, all Christ's teaching points in the direction of inequality of endowments, riches, possessions, rewards, and punishments. There are ten and five talents, ten and five cities, given as rewards. There are few and many stripes given as punishments. It was a distinct refusal to act the part of the legal arbitrator whether the complaint were true or no, and had no relation to the justice or injustice of the claim.

Or, again, when some came to Him recounting the current talk of the hour about those who had been killed by the fall of a tower in Siloam, and about those Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices, He did not discuss the general questions thus propounded, but, true to His method, turned the generalities into an individual appeal—"Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish."

Or, again, when speaking of the kingdom of Heaven (or of God), when surely, if ever, He would have used Collectivist language, He said, "Strive, agonize, to enter in by the strait gate," for only by a door admitting individual men and women can the narrow way be entered. And although He did commission the infant Church to make disciples of all nations, it was by baptism and by teaching that they were to fulfil their task; and baptism, whether as the sign or the means, or both,

of the new birth, is an individual ceremony in which the *ego* of the renunciation and of the Creed are equally prominent with the grafting into the body of the Church of Christ and the communion of saints.

And, again, when inquired of as to when the kingdom of God should come, He said, "It is not in this place, or in that place. It is within you." And although I admit that, so far as grammar is concerned, the interpretation that renders this as meaning "The kingdom of God is in the midst of you," i.e. in Himself, or in the Apostles as representing the Church, is allowable, yet the spirit of the passage and the whole drift of the Lord's teaching exclude this interpretation, and force upon us the alternative one, that the kingdom of God was within those very scribes and Pharisees then and there potentially, to be manifested kinetically when they recognized the fact and submitted themselves to its dominion; that it was not to be sought in any institution or organization *per se*, however sacred, but that it was to be found, so far as each man was concerned, in the inmost depth of his own being, which is the life of the Christ in every man, and that from this as a centre it would influence every portion of its circumference in individual, social, national, ecclesiastical life.

The Christ, by silence at least, refused to take part in the much-needed social reforms of His day. Slavery—Roman slavery, with all that that phrase connoted—He left severely alone. Class distinctions were unknown to Him. A poor man Himself, some at least of His disciples were fairly well to do; women of the company ministered to Him of their substance; the rich young man whose special temptation lay in his riches was loved by Him equally with the outcast and the sinner, and the injunction to sell all that he had and give to the poor was one suited to his special case, and not intended for universal application, else there would soon have been a second redistribution needed for the benefit of the *quondam* rich. He did not attempt the repeal of a single unrighteous law, Jewish or Roman; and the new Law of the Sermon on the Mount was one that demanded as its very essential condition the adherence

and the devotion of the individual heart and conscience. He did not attempt the reform of the Jewish or Roman polity, much as they both required amendment. He was content if those who needed Him came to Him, if He could seek and find those who were wandering from His Father's Home, if He could loose those whom Satan had bound, and who were conscious of their bondage. Even the animal world seemed to be of slight consequence compared with individual men. He would expel the demons from human spirits, but He was not so anxious concerning the fate of the herd of swine. He had come to save man, and if that could be accomplished by the only method possible, viz. by the willing co-operation of man himself, He was content.

Was He, then, careless or indifferent as to the condition of things around Him? Did the inequalities of this world not press in upon His infinitely sensitive spirit? We dare not think so for a moment. How, then, do we explain His treatment of the question of social progress? There were three moving principles governing all His actions and inspiring all His words. First, that no reform was worth the making that did not begin with the hearts of the men to be reformed. Then, that this world was not the whole of which man has to take account. The third, and highest, that the Ruler of the world was His Father, and the Father of all men, in Whose Fatherly care all the wants of His creatures are ever remembered. He knew that it was of no use to reform a man's environment without first reforming the man himself, and that if the man were reformed the new life would quickly modify its environment. He knew that if the soul of man did not obtain the heavenly outlook which a belief in immortality alone can give, it would inevitably lay up for itself treasure upon the earth. He knew and He taught that there are varying degrees of value attached to the different parts of man's complex nature (none being without a value), and that if man learned to value rightly his spiritual nature he would soon assess the comparative worth of all else in him and about him. There were things whose quest was the main occupation of the nations. Christ did not say that they were

evil or unimportant, but they were not primary. It is not necessary that a man shall live. It is necessary that he shall be a true man, even at the cost of earthly existence.

And what He preached, He practised, and His own life is the best and only adequate commentary upon His words. To Him the Fatherhood of God was the secret source and spring of His daily life. To Him prayer and fasting were more effectual weapons against evil than any that the Jewish council or the Roman legions could supply. To Him the relation of the human soul to the Father, the idea of sonship and all that it involves towards God and towards man, was the one thing that sinful men needed for their healing. To show men the Father, and the Father in Himself, was the work He had come into the world to do by His life and by His death ; and that being done, He left the world and returned to the Father. Principles, not details, were the legacy He left behind Him. His method was that of the physician, and not that of the member of Parliament ; the method of the poet, and not that of the Social Democrat.

“ I hold you will not compass your poor ends
Of barley-feeding and material ease,
Without a poet's individualism
To work your universal. It takes a soul
To move a body : it takes a high-souled man
To move the masses, even to a cleaner sty :
It takes the ideal to blow a hair's-breadth off
The dust of the actual. Ah, your Fouriers failed,
Because not poets enough to understand
That life develops from within.”¹

But where Fouriers failed, the Christ triumphed.

If, then, Christ came to Chicago, or to London, what would He do ? It will have been evident by this time that my remarks have been leading up to this question ; and I choose Mr. Stead's title and book, because they represent precisely the antithesis that I want to indicate. That Chicago needs reform is beyond question. The facts in that remarkable and appalling volume are beyond dispute, and have not been disputed, so far as

¹ *Aurora Leigh.*

I am aware. That London needs reform is beyond question, though, if we came to details, we might differ, and so I use Chicago as a safer illustration. When I read that book, as I did with quick breath and burning cheeks, I did not pause till I had read every page from beginning to end, and I laid it down with a feeling, first, of shame and sorrow for the destruction of an ideal, for I had thought better things of the city and of the genius of the American people for government, and then of hopelessness if nothing more could be done than is indicated in the concluding chapters. For as I read the proposed remedies—proposed, remember, as the remedies of Christ Himself—I pictured the new Chicago built on the lines of the Civic Church, and the picture was one of Christ's own painting—a whited sepulchre, fair to look upon without, but lacking the essential element of life. Granted all Mr. Stead's reforms:—granted a corporation that cannot be bribed; assessors that cannot be tampered with; drink that shall neither poison nor intoxicate; theatres that shall instruct and amuse, but not degrade; a police that shall be free from even the shadow of suspicion of blackmail, and that shall consist mostly of women; a well-regulated and profitable system of tramways and steam-cars, working the men eight hours a day and paying them a living wage; an electorate like that of Athens (only that there shall be no slaves), every member of which shall take an active and intelligent interest in politics, local and federal; a community in which every man and woman shall be compelled to take a full and fair share of work; granted perfect drainage, immense turbines for generating force, centralized municipal wealth, no smoke, gas stoves, enormous dust and garbage destructors, asphalt pavements, underground communication, free street railways, pneumatic tubes everywhere for letters and telegrams, landscape gardens galore, public libraries, polytechnics, new saloons, free lavatories, a Church with a Cardinal at the head and a Unitarian for a vice-president, a bureau of visitation, an organized confessional, music of the best, schools of the most expensive and perfect description including cookery not as an extra, a circus in every park, and a theatre in every ward, three Zoos, great central markets and

no middlemen, City Council stores, sky-scrappers built for the purpose of co-operative housekeeping, no pawnbrokers except City Council ones demanding ten per cent. per annum (this ought to have been free like the medical service), picture galleries, fountains, pageants, aquatic *fêtes*, and the German Emperor coming to receive the freedom of the city of Chicago, the new Jerusalem of the Western World:—granted all this, and what have you got?

Now, do not misunderstand me. I am not discussing the advisability or otherwise of this programme. I could sign nine-tenths of it, and laugh heartily over the rest. But from my point of view as a Christian reformer it is simply *nihil ad rem*. It is precisely what Christ would not do if He came to Chicago or to any other city, if I read aright His method of action nineteen centuries ago. It is a programme that He would have declined to discuss, and which He would have set aside with the strong phrase, "Vade Satana!" He would not have been indifferent to the evils, the woes and wrongs of the men and women of the city, and He would have reclaimed them, but not in that way. I doubt very much whether He would have indicated the twentieth century as the dawn of the new millennium, and whether He would have regarded the City Council as the proper centre for His operations.

In fact, Mr. Stead himself acknowledges that his proposed system breaks down, and that in a crucial point, and one that may fairly be taken as a test. "Sexual incontinence is not a crime, and should not be treated as such. It is a sin which should be left to the moralist and the Christian teacher. It only comes within the lash of the law when it becomes the source of disorder, public scandal, and actual crime."¹ Precisely so, and that is precisely the whole difference between the method of the Collectivist and the method of the Christ. The Christ attacked sin. Mr. Stead attacks crime in all its phases, individual, commercial, civil, national. Mr. Stead is, of course, personally, far better than his system, and in practice he does the very thing for which I am all through contending. He does raise

¹ Page 371.

the individual social outcast, and bring all the power of his strong, sympathetic nature to bear upon him or her, and does it in a way and to a degree that few can emulate and all must admire. But when he tells us that if Christ came to Chicago He would adopt and carry out Mr. Stead's social programme, he is betraying an ignorance of the larger issues at stake that is as remarkable as it is disastrous.

I have taken Mr. Stead as an illustration, but he does not stand alone. He is typical of a movement, a movement in which there is much good, and much harm,—good in its aim, harm in its method, and in the means adopted for its realization.

Revert, for a moment, to the twofold division of man into germ and environment—man himself and his surroundings external and internal, life and the conditions of life, subjective and objective. You can undoubtedly touch environment by law, by legislation. You can never touch a man in the way that Christ touched him, by that means. Acts of Congress, Acts of Parliament, can never touch and reform an individual. They are not intended so to affect him; and if they were so intended, the intention could not be carried out. "*De minimis non curat lex*" ("The law does not take account of trifles") is a true maxim. A perfect law would have to be so complex as to be unwieldy if every loophole of escape were to be effectually guarded, and even then it would not make the man a better man. It might make him more orderly, more decent: it might make him pay a larger income tax on a graduated scale, and a heavier death duty on inherited estate, real or personal. But the man himself would be untouched. I know only one Act of Parliament directed in modern times against an individual, and that succeeded because the man himself indicated what line the legislation should take to be effectual. It was a short Act of one clause, involving the alteration of a single word, and on my own initiation the Government of the day was good enough to make it a public Bill, and to see it through the House of Commons, it being a money Bill. The old Act had worked very well until it came into operation in our own parish, and then one public official, perfectly conscientiously, took a different

reading of the clause, and involved the parish in more trouble and expense. I asked him what wording would imply to him the meaning that every one else attached to the clause of the old Act. He answered a simple alteration of the word "as" into the word "with." The alteration was made, and the single individual converted and reformed, civically. But what a process ! And it is a typical one if Mr. Stead's method is worth anything at all. And it might not in every case secure the willing adhesion of the persons aimed at. They might lobby against it, or by one of the accidents of parliamentary life throw it out or hopelessly mutilate it, as my unique baby Bill was nearly mutilated by watchful railway and canal companies on another tack altogether. It is a trite saying, but true, that you cannot make men better by Act of Parliament. Men can only be made truly and lastingly better by personal contact with God. I would rather teach one man to pray than make ten men compulsorily sober. I should not be sure of the ten, but I should be sure of the one man, sure of a work lasting on into eternity.

How, then, do we stand as Christian men and women, and especially as officers of Christian Churches? What does the Christ want us to do in His name in this London of ours to-day ?

There are two forces at work making for good, the Church and the State, and it does not matter from my point of view what opinion we hold with regard to the relations between these two. If we hold the Church to be purely spiritual, and the State purely secular, if Cæsar is to us so abominable a person that the Church must needs be contaminated by any contact with him, then my argument is easy and sure to prevail. But if, as some do, we hold the State to be one expression of human life, and the Church another expression of the same life, if we hold it to be possible that the Church should be regarded as a branch of the State, as in our own country, or the State a branch of the Church, as in the Middle Ages, and as apparently in Mr. Stead's idea, then the argument is a little more complex, but none the less cogent.

I need scarcely deal with the former phase of thought at all. Those who hold it are perfectly clear on this matter, and I need only specify references. Read Principal Cave's new work on *The Spiritual World*, Dr. Barrett's address from the chair of the Congregational Union on *The Secularization of the Pulpit*, or any of Dr. Parker's sermons (not his two minute topical addresses) or the leading articles in the *British Weekly*, among the most helpful and spiritual reading that I know anywhere, or Principal Fairbairn's *Religion in History and in the Life of To-day* (the new edition), and you will have a far better exposition of the Church's work regarded as something separate from, and sometimes as alien to, the work of the State than anything I could lay before you, and so far as method is concerned I most heartily agree with them.

But the other view is growing, not only within the limits of the Church of England, but also in other divisions of the Church Catholic, Roman and Puritan, and it is here that it is more difficult to steer a clear course. But I think it can be done.

If the Church be a branch of the State, or the State a department of the Church, then by the application of two leading principles governing the progress of all higher forms of development, we can trace the dividing line between the operations of these two allied forces, at least approximately enough for all practical purposes. These two principles are those of the division of labour and of specialization as flowing from it. In the reform of the world the Church and the State have both their part to play. They have each their sphere of action, related and mutually and sympathetically in touch with each other. They have each their own methods of operation, not antagonistic but complementary.

The State can remove hindrances, the State can minimize temptations of an external kind, the State can improve conditions of life, the State can punish flagrant violations of order, the State can compel mutual interest to be respected by means of taxation, the State can, if inspired by the Church, infuse justice and righteousness into her laws and into the Administration of them. But she cannot touch the hidden springs of action. She

cannot influence the higher motives of life. She cannot play upon the affections. She cannot enter into the region of the inner chamber where the soul holds communion with God. Inasmuch as her behests must be carried out by individual men and women, these in the discharge of their duties will be Christian or non-Christian *qua* their individual relation to God, and not *qua* their position as members or officials of the State.

The Church, on the other hand, has weapons in her armoury which the State has not and cannot have. She can take account of individual characteristics and circumstances in a way which the law cannot do. She can recognize motives, instead of taking account of overt actions only. She can bring to bear upon individual men and women sanctions for ethics that are not open to the legislature. The legislature can at best promise the fine or the felon's cell to the offender, and in modern times promises no reward to the well-doer. The Church can promise the reward of a good conscience, the formation of a stable character, the inheritance of a future life to those that do well, and can (in any view of the next world) predict loss to those who misuse opportunity or who infringe the laws of God. The Church can so influence character as to cause her influence to be felt throughout the whole sphere of a man's life. By making him a better man she makes him a better citizen, and so makes her influence felt in the affairs of the city and of the State, transforming them silently and gradually by the slow process of individual conviction and personal influence; but she does this by influencing units and not numbers. The Church reforms men, and does not espouse causes as such. She does not depend on legislation for her success. She can make a man independent of the subsidiary question of public-houses or no public-houses, or of the number and quality of such as are allowed to exist, by inspiring him with power and personal moral courage, the sense of the reality of prayer, and the nearness of the Christ to help in the hour of temptation. If she cannot do this, then in God's name let her perish, and something more effectual take her place! But she can, and does do it, every day. This is her special function, her branch of the work of reform, her division of the labour of

building up the New Jerusalem. In this department she is bound to succeed if she be faithful to the example of her Master, and prayerfully dependent upon the guidance and inspiration of His Spirit. Her work is auxiliary to the more external work of the State, and not antagonistic to it. She does not seek for, nor lay stress upon, immediate results. The twentieth century is nothing to her, for all time is in the Father's eternal keeping. She has not only time to draw upon, for her vista is not closed by the cold gate of the tomb. She cares little for material prosperity in her members, deeming it her chief business to tend and develop the immortal spirit. She knows no distinction of class or caste. To her the democracy does not mean the poor only, but the whole family of the nation, and she has duties to the rich as well as to the destitute. To her, "capital" and "labour," "employer" and "employed" are terms with no connotation. Equal at her altars, men of all conditions of life are her children, not because they are rich or because they are poor, not because they are labourers with the hand or the brain or the heart, but simply because they are men. Her Churches are the Churches of the people, that is of all the people. "A labour Church," to quote Dr. Fairbairn, "is a creation more of despair than of hope, an attempt, as it were, to sanctify an evil, rather than to cure it. The terms 'Master' and 'Servant,' 'Capital' and 'Labour,' denote relations the Church ought not to know, and may not recognize, and to embody such distinctions in her very name is but to run up the flag of surrender."

Need I go more into detail, and specify some of the ways in which the Churches of our day (not confined to any one denomination) are not realizing this imperfectly expressed ideal of the function of the Body spiritual, are not, so to speak, minding their own business, and so are neglecting their real work? There are Churches in which the sermons delivered are but reproductions, in other words (and not always in other words), of the leading articles in, say, the *Daily Chronicle*, a purely party organ, in which the topics discussed are the same as those discussed every day of the week in clubs and newspapers, and in which the machinery of the Church is used to further the interests

of some special social movement of the time. I do not say whether these movements *per se* are right or wrong. But I do say that they are not the particular work of that part of the organism that we call the Church, nor is the method of their solution the method of the Christ. We call this "preaching to the times," and "getting hold of the people," and we think that such phrases will cover the real dereliction of duty involved in such a course. The need of the Church of to-day is a true and living theology, a true thought of God, a true view of Christ, a true grasp of the meaning of the Spirit, a true estimate of the earthly life and its relation to the future, a true knowledge of the power and reality of prayer, a true conception of Christian perfection as implying the uplifting of the whole family of man by means of the growth and perfecting of the individuals composing that family, a living grasp of the principle of Christian unity as flowing from a burning love and not as depending upon mere organization and temporal accident. Men are yearning to know God, and to know themselves as His children, yearning to know the meaning of their Bibles and the relation of the word of Revelation to the inspiration promised to every man who reads it with the longing for guidance. Men are asking for bread, and some of our clergy and ministers are giving them stones. Instead of spending time and energy in seeking out the truth, they are engaged in addressing meetings of cabmen and others on strike, or in canvassing their parishes or congregations for the ensuing County Council or Parliamentary election. It is an age of experts, and no man can be an expert in every department of knowledge, and while we are tampering with questions we do not understand, and have not time to master, we are neglecting the study of the one thing we are supposed to understand, and upon which men will listen to us silently and gratefully. The County Council cannot "minister to a mind diseased, pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow," and yet in Christ's name this and like ministries of love are the special business of the Church, and, *à fortiori*, the peculiar business of those who minister in the name of the Lord. The eight-hours movement and the living wage are of no avail in the face

of moral evil, and the uprooting of moral evil is the task allotted to the disciple of the Cross. Teach a master that he must not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn, and he will personally and voluntarily treat well those who serve him, as thousands of masters do in London to-day. Teach a servant that that which his hands find to do he must do with all his might, and there will be no falling off in the quality of English workmanship.

But in truth we must, in conclusion, go deeper. The new democracy is in very deed being seriously misled by the attempt to apply State methods, methods of legislation, to objects that can only be touched by purely individual means. They are being told (and there is just enough truth in the statement to make it the more dangerous) that social reform is going to transform the face of the earth, and that right speedily; that the social millennium is within hail (the twentieth century—six years off); and that a few good spurts will win the race and secure the prize. With what result? That the more far-sighted among them see clearly enough that the picture painted is one of vanity and vexation of spirit, and, since they lack that element of faith which alone can make social progress feasible, and which alone can nerve men for the long struggle it involves, viz. the belief in God and in a future life, they determine to seek it in what they regard as a shorter and a surer road, and the murdered President of the nation upon whose escutcheon is emblazoned the misleading watchword of “Liberty, Fraternity, and Equality” is the sad but powerful commentary upon a fatal mistake.

The Collectivist ideal may be right, but, even if it be right, it can only be attained by Individualist methods. The goal may be there truly enough, but the path to it is a narrow and a thorny one, and one that must be travelled by many generations. To attain it means to exterminate suffering, and I see no promise in nature or in revelation that suffering shall cease on this side of the grave.

I said just now, that the Christ would apply to Mr. Stead’s proposed Collectivist machinery of reform, the words “Get thee hence, Satan!” and I purposely used the mere words without

comment or explanation. But such a programme was actually before the mind and spirit of the Christ. Be the explanation of the Temptation in the Wilderness what it may—be the record symbolic or historical, matters not. It is plainly the record of an experience; and whether the suggestion came from the mind of the Christ Himself, brooding over the problem of the work that lay before Him, or were the suggestion of an external power of evil, matters not for my present purpose. The problem did present itself to the mind of the Lord to use the State method of reform; to possess Himself of the wonderful resources and energies of Roman, Jewish, and Oriental civilization; to put Himself at the head of the kingdoms of the world, and be acclaimed King of men. And the temptation was real, for He could have done it. That which was not quite possible for Alexander the Great, was possible for the Son of Mary, for the Son of God. And He made the Great Renunciation. There was a deeper word, "Thou shalt worship, thou shalt serve, God." He chose for Himself the strait gate and the narrow path. He refused the speedy but delusive victory, and chose for His triumph chariot the long procession of the centuries, the cycles of the ebbing and the flowing tide, the slow but sure ascent of the *Via Crucis*, that was the true *Via Lucis*. Was He right, or was He wrong?

FREDERIC RELTON.

THE PLEA FOR A LIVING WAGE.

EVERY student of the history of economic ideas must be struck by the permanence of the notion of an average wage. The purely scientific writers assume it, and set themselves to explain its origin, the conditions which determine it, and those, again, which determine aberration from it. The artistic and didactic writers, who aim, let us say, at improving the condition of the working class, strive to show how it may be permanently raised. Thus, Adam Smith speaks of a "natural rate of wages," which is determined by the "expense of maintaining the population." When wages are above this rate, population—i.e. those seeking employ—increases; when they sink below it, population declines proportionally. Ricardo takes the same view, but with important modifications. For him wages are fixed by the standard of comfort, and vary according to conditions of time and place; but at every time and place there is a point to which they tend, a sufficiency to maintain population, according to men's ideas of maintenance. In modern schemes a natural or, as we now call it, a normal rate of wages is often assumed, tacitly, but not the less definitely. All sliding scales, for instance, presuppose a wage from which the sliding scale works, raising wages as the price of the commodity rises, and *vice versa*. Profit-sharing, again, starts from a basis, a *terminus a quo*, a something to which additions are made out of the results of labour, additions determined by the amount or value of those results. It is this "something," this fixed point, whether it be called natural, normal, or average rate of wages, which has been christened in modern times the living wage, and it has been taken to represent a minimum below which wages are not to fall, but above which they may fluctuate as circumstances decide.

Let us look at it for a moment in the light of economic theory. Adam Smith's natural wage is in a sense a living wage, in the sense of his own definition of living. For him living implied no more than the physical minimum. If wages were above the living rate, then, in answer to an imperious instinct, population increased; if they fell below it, population failed to increase, for children could not live. Ricardo's theory is based on different grounds; in place of nature the human will is the motive power. If wages are not sufficient to satisfy a current standard of living, *i.e.* to support men according to their notion of living, the labouring population will diminish till they are. But, whereas in the *Wealth of Nations* nature decides the standard of living, in Ricardo's treatise it is determined by the labourers themselves. The result is much the same for any actual generation, but the hopefulness of Ricardo is great compared with the pessimism of Adam Smith. The theory of Ricardo is elaborated by Malthus, and one particular aspect of it worked out in his *Principles of Population*. The position of Mill is, as so often, doubtful; he is the Janus of economics. He looks back, in the sense of being loyal to the teaching of those who went before him, and he leans to the theory that wages are independent of the will of the labourer, and depend mainly on the strength of the motives to the accumulation of capital. He looks forward, and he inclines to the view that the future of the labouring class is more in their own hands than he quite likes to think. But for him throughout the cardinal points are the wage-fund and the Malthusian theory. Nature has to a great extent disappeared, but her place is taken by the capitalist, as a factor in determining the destinies of the workman. So far, then, the living wage is more akin to the theory of Ricardo than any other. Ricardo declared that wages would be at a certain point fixed by the labourers themselves; the new unionists ask no more than that this point should be made clear, and should be taken as a basis by both sides in industrial controversy. How is it that a pestilent heresy, as many think it, has so much in common with the pronouncement of the father of orthodox economics?

No doubt Ricardo laid it down that wages would represent the workman's desires or ambitions; they would practically be enough to satisfy his requirements, but it was on one condition. The wages of labour—and in this he is followed by Mr. Gunton in more modern times—are such as the labourers demand, only they must be prepared to back their demand. They must be sufficiently wedded to their standard to prefer it to any other form of wedlock. Thus he denies the assertion of Adam Smith that population will necessarily increase if wages rise, for it may be voluntarily restricted, and then the rise will be permanent. If the labourers are strongly attached to their standard, they set nature at defiance, and there is no natural rate of wages. Now, the new unionists, the advocates of a living wage, beat away from Ricardo on this point. They accept his result, but they ignore the process by which it is attained. Where he wrote "will" they prefer to write "shall." What he described as the outcome of a long and painful process, they propose to guarantee by a stroke of the pen. Practically there is a great deal hidden behind that simple sentence of Ricardo's, that wages will follow the labourer's interpretation of the phrase "living"—a period of almost secular evolution. Can all this be assumed at the present day, and stereotyped, so to say, for public use? Can we say that the battle has been won, that the advantage of a high standard is seen so clearly that the struggle is over, and that we may assume it henceforth? Have we no more to do than to occupy the field? It were surely rash to say so. In the background still hovers the spectre of over-population. Reduce, it is urged, the motives to prudence in this matter, and humanity will go back to the state of things described by Adam Smith, which is the curse of Ireland. Living will mean less and less; it will gradually come to be no more than bare subsistence; civilization will stand still, and, when it stands still, worse may be feared. The strength of this feeling, the influence it exerts over men's minds, even when they protest against it most loudly, is seen in many curious ways. It is seen in the attempts of the older trade-unions to limit population for their particular purpose,

and in their particular industry. It appears, again, in the modern outcry against the mobility of labour, and the attempt to remove every pauper alien back to his national settlement. These are efforts to escape from an uneasy feeling that, after all, Malthus was right, and the rate of wages is a question, primarily, of population. On the other side, the advocates of a living wage claim to be heard. To secure a high standard is your aim. Well, how do you propose to do it? Do you think that men who live like pigs, whose housing and clothing and general manner of life are of the lowest, are likely to feel a craving for better things? The appetite comes in eating; the use of power is the best education for the possessor; the higher standard is within the horizon of those only who have been raised. It is useless nowadays, they urge, to leave the matter to work itself out, you must put some water in the pump to make it draw. We have here a large and difficult question. Let us face it boldly, and pass on.

Modern theories of wages have directed attention mainly to another side of the question, viz. the product of labour. Thanks to the writings of General Walker and others, the relation in which wages stand to product has absorbed the public mind. The disproof of the hypothesis that wages are determined by capital gave rise to a fresh hypothesis, for the healthy mind abhors a vacuum. The new explanation of wages is found in the results of labour, which are held to determine the value of the labourer and his reward. Now, if wages are fixed wholly by the product of labour, to take an extreme supposition, as best illustrating the point, in what position is the living wage? How far is it possible, and how far desirable in practice? The problem has a literature of its own, and I can only summarize the chief points of it. At first sight it seems as if a living wage is incompatible with the product theory. Pay every man according to his worth, and determine his worth by the amount or value of his product, and a natural, normal, or living wage is inconceivable. But, it is answered, the argument is double-edged. Wages depend on product, but product also depends on wages. Pay a man a wage sufficient to keep him sound in

wind and limb, guarantee him the conditions of the *mens sana*, and he will produce much, and so earn a high wage. The two go hand in hand, high wages make large product, and large product justifies, if it does not actually make, high wages. On this point writers have enlarged, not by any means unanimously. There are those who urge that experience all makes in favour of the position above stated—Brentano, Schoenhof, and others. There are those, again, who deny it entirely. A study of the arguments on either side inclines me to the conclusion that the balance is on the side of those who maintain that high wages and large product go together, and that the first is the cause in many cases of the second. But, even granting this, we must go on to ask, How far is this a guide to the future? Can we argue from what has been to what will be? Clearly we cannot go on *ad infinitum*; there must be a point at which a rise in wages will cease to bring about a corresponding increase in product. Who is to make the experiment, and to prove, by bitter experience, where that point is? A manufacturer may be pardoned if he decline to purchase the immortality of having shown it at the cost of his own failure in business. And the question is bound up with yet another, viz. the hours of labour. Shorter hours, like high wages, no doubt increase the product up to a certain point, at least proportionately. Shorter hours, again, are necessary to secure the full benefit of higher wages, otherwise the labourer will eat and drink all that he receives. But what clue have we to guide us to the discovery of that point? The question was discussed by Mr. Hobson in a paper on "Wages, Hours of Labour, and Productivity," which he read at the recent meeting of the British Association, and he showed that no definite answer could be given *à priori*, experience must decide.

These considerations have led us away from our subject, but they are bound up with it; for the arguments on which the plea for a living wage is based are the same as those by which high wages are justified. Give to all the wages necessary to maintain efficiency, and a great increase in the product will be seen. It is a venture, but reason and experience point clearly

to its success, so clearly that manufacturers may fairly be compelled to make it—such is the argument. Now here, as in the preceding discussion, a distinction must be drawn. It may be quite true that high wages mean large product, so long as the labourer has the stimulus to make himself increasingly efficient. The prospect of higher wages gives that stimulus, and nature answers to the spur. But the advocates of a living wage remove that stimulus in the case of all who are content with the living wage, and give them, on the contrary, every motive not to earn it. In all ranks of life it has been observed that, if a man's income is divided into two parts, one of which depends upon his exertions, and the other is a fixed payment for definite work, his activity gradually transfers itself from the second to the first. When wages were paid in part out of the poor-rate, and were in part earned, the former grew until it swallowed up the latter. Is it the case that we can now afford to dispense with any motive to exertion and to efficiency? It is urged, and with much of truth, that the growth of human desire, especially in variety, is motive enough; that, if you put a man in secure possession of a given amount of the objects of desire, he will go on to earn more and more, but that his appetite must be whetted. Ambition can only be for visible objects, and the unskilled labourer realizes how much is beyond his grasp, not how much might be brought within it. How far is this argument sound? It would need a long experience of a living wage, universally paid, to assure us on the point. At present, it is being tried in very limited fields. Governments, central and local, are making the experiment. The War Office, *e.g.*, as employer, pays a higher wage than can be earned for the same work in the open market. The result, no doubt, is to stimulate men in the struggle for Government employ. If we could be certain that work would always be given on grounds of efficiency, this would be satisfactory, as far as it goes, but even then we should have no ground for arguing to the general effect of such conduct. The limited amount of such employment retains the competitive motive for the present. Granting, again, that a

man has been "taken on," he has good grounds for recommending himself by his efficiency, lest his place should be given to another. But make a living wage universal, and all these causes cease to operate.

We fall back upon the question, What would be the result of a living wage on the amount produced, the total of wealth realized in any given time? Would it be as great, greater, or less than at the present? In the absence of any calculus of human motive, it is impossible to foresee. The London County Council, says Mr. Webb, in fixing the rate of payment for work, irrespective of competition for it, are doing no more than is done in all the higher walks of life. He has omitted to show that the results in those higher walks justify the procedure, and "much might be said on both sides." Let any one compare the amount and the quality of work done by those who are independent of competition, with the amount and quality of that done by those whose livelihood depends on their success, and he will hesitate, I think, to give a very decided answer in favour of one or the other. It may be that the advocates of the one system have underrated the complexity of modern life, the need for applying different principles of reward to different kinds of labour. It may be that the supporters of competition, "through thick and thin," have paid too little attention to the evil effects on a man's higher qualities as a labourer of a grinding, ceaseless struggle for existence.

L. R. PHELPS.

NICHOLSON'S "PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY."¹

IT may very well be doubted whether the condition of economics or the practical requirements of the time are favourable to the production of "systems of Political Economy ;" whether, indeed, there is not a much more imperative demand for the resolution of "Political Economy" into particular problems of analysis or investigation. This presumption against treatises or complete text-books is not likely to be diminished by the publication of a whole in parts. In the case of Professor Marshall's *Principles*, this method of issue did not so much matter, because his treatment of the subject is dominated by the conception of a fundamental unity pervading the parts of the science. This unity of idea, which is made manifest from the first, is found in the general theory of the equilibrium of demand and supply, which is successively applied to particular problems of wages, interest, profits, and rent. But the volume before us proceeds by departments, in mechanical juxtaposition to each other, under the traditional titles and in the traditional order of Production and Distribution, with Exchange "to follow in our next." A volume of over four hundred pages upon Political Economy without a theory of value is very like Hamlet without the Prince. It is true that Professor Nicholson so far deviates from Mill's order of treatment as to interpolate in his account of Production a chapter on Utility and another on Consumption (most of which the general reader is recommended to pass over); but they seem quite out of place from his own point of view, which insists on the propriety of a separate treatment of distribution and, *à fortiori*, production, antecedent to exchange. Whatever may be the cogency of the reasons for which the professor dissents from the centrality of Marshall's treatment (which is really, after all, implicit in Adam Smith), it is clear that the difficulty of estimating the value of his *Principles* is greatly increased. If we can argue from the instalment before us, we are inclined to think that the total book will have much more the

¹ *Principles of Political Economy*. By J. Shield Nicholson, M.A., D.Sc., Professor of Political Economy in the University of Edinburgh. [vi., 451 pp. 8vo. 15s. Black. London, 1893.]

character of a mosaic than an organism, and that its value will lie in particulars. As a general treatise, I cannot help thinking it will conspicuously fail in throwing any new or important light upon economic science or method : I should go further, and say that it is a not altogether involuntary anachronism. On the other hand, it may be of importance that a reactionary and retrograde view of a not very firmly established science should be presented in a form which is at once clear and emphatic.

It may be well to quote Professor Nicholson's own account of the genesis and idea of his book. "The present work is intended to cover the same ground as that of Mill. It has grown out of my notes" (given in lectures, with Mill as a text-book), "and whilst presenting the older doctrines, takes account also of subsequent modifications. It must be regarded, however, not so much as an abstract of the opinions of others, as an independent attempt to recast the subject in the light of these opinions ;" and his endeavour has been, as he puts it elsewhere, "to build on the broad foundations of Adam Smith and Mill without trenching unduly on the domain of ethics, jurisprudence, or politics." He explains, however, that in reality he owes "far more to Adam Smith than to Mill." "The great defect of Mill's work is the want of historical knowledge, whilst a large part of the *Wealth of Nations* is history of the highest order. I have availed myself of the authority of the older master to include a much greater amount of history than is usual in a statement of principles." The use of history is the most conspicuous and distinctive, and possibly the most valuable, feature of Professor Nicholson's *Principles*. The history is at times somewhat discursive and disproportionate ; it has more the character of "being brought in" than we should expect from a disciple of Adam Smith ; and it is perhaps somewhat teleologically interpreted. But the reader will find the researches of Rogers, Seebohm, and others turned to excellent account. On the other hand, it cannot be said that the professor's book palpitates with the actuality of the *Wealth of Nations* : the genius of Adam Smith is revealed in his power of observation, and observation is certainly conspicuous by its absence in the volume before us. A reader of it would hardly guess, except from a passing reference, that combinations played any prominent part in modern industry, or that freedom of contract is becoming much more the exception than the rule. I am afraid that nothing in the book, beyond frequent reference to the *Wealth of Nations*, recalls the manner and method of its author. Adam Smith was nothing if not actual, just as his book is nothing if not organic, and, I would venture to affirm, implicitly, at least, connected with ethics and sociology. The book

before us is just such a book as Adam Smith would not have written at the close of the nineteenth century.

Another ground of exception to Mill is his ethical and philanthropic temper, which Professor Nicholson regards as a disturbing element in economic analysis ; and particular criticism is directed against the excess of emphasis which Mill laid upon population, and his celebrated (and far-reaching) distinction between the necessary "laws of production" and the optional laws of distribution. (Mill puts this distinction in a much more guarded and suggestive way than one would expect from Professor Nicholson's elaborate and not strictly relevant criticism of it.) On the other hand, his arrangement of the subject follows Mill rather than Adam Smith.

The most general formal defect of the book is, as suggested, the absence of any such pervading principle as would give a unity of structure to the variety of matter considered. This shows itself in abruptness of transitions and neglect of proportion, and may be due to the original form of lectures, but is probably much more due to the want of a central conception. Some of the chapters would certainly make good lectures ; but a treatise upon economics as a whole seems to require a more instructive and organic handling.

Not having the complete work before me, I propose to limit detailed criticism to some of the points on which the professor insists in the introduction, these being advanced chiefly with a view to define and restrict the scope of the science.

1. The province of Political Economy "may," says the professor, "perhaps be best described provisionally in the words of Adam Smith, as an inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations." It is significant that Professor Nicholson at once strikes a different note from Professor Marshall, to whom "the question whether poverty is necessary gives its highest interest to economics." The difference of emphasis and of bias is instructive : it is not merely a difference of temper or of interest ; it is fundamental. It might be suggested that Professor Nicholson's conception and treatment of economics is not only conspicuously insular, but even local. It is certainly truer of the disciple than the master that he writes as if there was a Scotchman inside every man : his point of view is frankly commercial rather than ethical or sociological. But the difference goes deeper than that, and partly explains why the professor has not followed the more recent and certainly more excellent method of putting consumption before production and distribution. As the Germans would put it, he treats economics as the science of the production of goods, rather than the production of satisfactions. His point of view, therefore, stops short

at the facts which can alone give any real interest or significance to the study of "the nature and causes of wealth." The significance of the prominence which is being given to the analysis of value and utility as the basis of economics, and the tendency to place consumption before production, is the indication which it gives that economics is becoming more and more one of the sciences which deal with life, and less and less one concerned with mere commodity; or, as Roscher puts it, "the subject of Political Economy is man." Whatever may be the practical value of the contributions made to economic theory by Jevons and the Austrian economists, from the side of what one may call social psychology, it must be conceded that their analysis of the "subjective factors" in Political Economy has given a new life and a fresh impulse to economic theory in all its departments, and certainly lighted up, as Plato might say, its "hypotheses." It has also brought it into a much more definite relation to sociology. The influence of this tendency is paramount in Professor Marshall's *Principles*; it is not only ignored, but resisted, by Professor Nicholson. The result is that so much of the book is, in the deepest sense, unmeaning, and the real problems of "economics," of progress *and* poverty, of "distribution" in the widest and most significant sense, are untouched. A reference to Professor Marshall's list of "questions to be investigated" by economics (bk. i. ch. 8, § 3), *à fortiori* to his enumeration of the "practical issues which stimulate the inquiries of the English economist at the present time," will give the reader some idea of the number of questions on which Professor Nicholson's book throws no light at all. It was at one time thought that economics was to be transformed, or at any rate enriched, by historical and statistical research: it is likely to gain much more from analysis and "the deductive method" (as described by Mill); and it is just in this kind of work that Professor Nicholson's *Principles* fall short. What analysis, for instance, do we find of "competition"? It is, after all, a very complex conception; and the elements in competition neglected by the ordinary economist are just those which are most actual and significant.

2. Professor Nicholson approves of the gradual specialization of economics, but would draw the line somewhere. He endeavours to steer between the Scylla which would reduce economics to a "branch of applied mathematics," and the Charybdis which would absorb it into a "general sociology." The result is a very restricted treatment of economic phenomena, and within the limits prescribed a disposition to stop short in analysis. The treatise is a reaction, mostly deliberate, against two tendencies which Marshall combines—the tendency to specialized analysis, and the tendency to enlarge the data and the

premisses of the science. We find little of the deductive, still less of the historical spirit in the book before us. Professor Nicholson does not disguise his indifference towards the mathematical developments of final utility, consumers' rent, quasi-rent, and the like. "No expansion of the formula, 'the more we have the less we want,' can be a sufficient substitute for the enumeration of the many and various actual conditions which govern the consumption of wealth, and the prices of commodity and services." That may be very true, but it does not come very well from the author of this book. And it must be noted that the mathematical method has been specially helpful in exhibiting the mutual determination of supply and demand. But the differences between classical economists may be seen in their own journal: *non nostrum est tantas componere lites*. It certainly does not seem as if Professor Nicholson were up to the date of the conceptions, which he uses without analyzing. The sentence quoted suggests not only that Professor Nicholson's method is an anachronism in the development of the classical "organon" of political economy, but that this "organon" is itself an anachronism!

3. Professor Nicholson insists that "the phenomena of wealth are capable of separate classification, and the causes of separate investigation," in proof of which he cites the whole literature of Political Economy, and in particular the *Wealth of Nations* (which I should have thought rather pointed the other way). That a science of Political Economy can only be constituted by a provisional abstraction and isolation of the fact of the desire and pursuit of wealth from the other facts of society, needs no proof; but the question is whether the abstraction can be maintained, and whether the elements rejected may not be of more actual importance than the elements retained. Of what use, for instance, is an abstract theory of wages when the influences of combination, of education, of law, of public opinion, of a growing sense of social responsibility in modifying the conditions of competition are abstracted? Political Economy, the professor insists, is "not to be subsumed under sociology," nor "conjoined with ethics." The use of biological conceptions may be premature (witness, for instance, Mr. Kidd's book), and Aristotle's caution against the explanation of a specific set of phenomena by inappropriate conceptions is never out of date; but the assertion that "biology has as much to do with political economy as with constitutional history" is dangerously near nonsense. Not only has biology brought economic causes into relation with causes which are at once wider and more familiar (cf. the general law of competition), but it has made economic science itself sensitive to the great ideas of continuity and development, making, I

should have thought, the conception of the unalterable "economic man" of less and less service for economic explanation. Economics cannot be independent of any advance made in the related sciences, or in the laws of the science of social man as a whole; still less can it be independent of the development of human nature itself, which shows itself not least in the substitution of collective and conscious for individual and unconscious methods in the distribution of wealth. In the same way, it is increasingly difficult to maintain the separation between economics and ethics. It is certainly true that the object of science is to understand rather than to prescribe; and that Political Economy can be pursued as a science without any ulterior, ethical or practical purpose: although it is generally found that those who are at most pains to limit their assertions to what *is*, insensibly pronounce it at the same time as what *ought to be*. We agree that Professor Nicholson's description of Political Economy as a positive science, the object of which is to unfold principles, to discover uniformities, and to trace causal connections, and not to lay down precepts, set up ideals, or pronounce moral judgments, is a legitimate conception; but we cannot agree that the economist's data are either extra-ethical or extra-biological. And if that is so, it follows that Political Economy must take account of advance in ethical forces or springs of action generally, as well as of modifications in industrial structure. The advance of modern industry, as often pointed out, brings with it something socialistic: it takes more and more the form of combination of capital or labour, and its very scale and complexity give rise to a necessity for social control of a kind not dreamt of by Adam Smith. And, on the other hand, the sense of social responsibility and solidarity has been growing in a way which makes it impossible to isolate the economical from the ethical problem. Consider only the action of public opinion in the Dockers' Strike, the ethical-economic policy of Government and public bodies, the demand for a living wage and an Eight Hours Bill. All this and much else to the same effect make it less and less "possible henceforth to separate political economy from the general study of politics, or to discuss the laws of the production and distribution of wealth apart from the consideration of the relation of the distribution of wealth and the modes of distributing it to other elements of social well-being." "The abstraction of science will always be necessary for thorough knowledge of economy as of everything else; but when we isolate parts of *human* existence, it is more important than in relation to any other subject to remember that we *are* abstracting—i.e. that we are dealing with fragments of a whole, of which no final account can be given by anatomy." These are the

words of a successor to Adam Smith's chair, and I believe they express the spirit of the earlier philosopher. "The practical value of the social science of the future will depend, not only on the way in which we break up the complete problem of our existence into manageable parts, but as much, and even more, upon the way in which we are able to gather the elements together again, and to see how they act and react upon each other in the living movement of the social body."

Space does not permit of detailed illustration of the manner in which Professor Nicholson neglects the development and modification of economic factors. He takes little or no account of the most significant set of influences in modern industry, viz. the motives of collective as compared with those of individual action ; he is, therefore, quite unable to appreciate the significance of Socialism, of the new demands for State action, of the growth of monopolies, of the extension of municipal industry. It is somewhat remarkable that a book which takes to itself the credit of being actual and positive, should give no attention to the phenomena of trusts and combinations—which to some minds seem to contain the germs of a new industrial organization, intermediate between the individualism of the present and the socialism of the future. And yet these organizations are the products, not of law or statute, but of economic forces ; but Professor Nicholson has deliberately cut himself off from the explanation of anything which does not come within "the laws of political economy" regarded as the "laws of competition and freedom." Competition assumes many forms in the progress of social evolution, and the form under which alone Professor Nicholson employs it without further analysis, viz. competition between individual interests, is just that form of it which is least permanent and least significant. The truth is that Professor Nicholson's treatment of Political Economy is ideal in the worst sense—that is, of being out of relation to any facts or tendencies, though logical in itself. Adam Smith used as an assumption what was a fact ; Professor Nicholson treats as a fact what is properly only an assumption. Adam Smith objected to State interference of a particular kind and on specific grounds ; Professor Nicholson objects to State interference of a new and particular kind on grounds applicable only to State interference of some quite different and obsolete kind. His attitude, in fact, to State interference is, like his attitude to any other movement, profoundly unhistorical. As an American writer has put it, "Concession after concession, qualification after qualification, has sapped the vitality of the doctrine of *laissez-faire*. It lacks the vigorous conviction, the conscious obviousness, and the confident appeal to current experience, which characterized the writings of Adam Smith. Even its calmest

advocates can hardly refrain from epithets and spleen. All signs indicate a readiness for a new prophet, a new Adam Smith, who shall interpret to us the signs of our times."

4. Finally, we may ask whether it is possible to investigate ethics without reference, explicit or implicit, to ethical ideals? Professor Nicholson clearly thinks that economics should be independent of any such reference, on the somewhat curious and inconclusive ground that "the arbitrary choice of a particular ethical ideal does not come within the province of economics." But if economic phenomena, more particularly in distribution, are subject to modification by conscious human effort, and are continually being so modified, an economist cannot maintain a hard-and-fast separation between what is and what should be. In other words, economics tends to be a "normative" science. And what can be clearer than that the professor's argument is coloured throughout by a tacit ideal, by a standard and criterion of economic good? How else can we explain his attitude towards *laissez-faire* and economic utopias — towards which, on his own showing, economics as a positive science should be neutral? His whole position assumes that economic distribution is a matter of ethical indifference; the only question is how it actually takes place under the assumption of free and perfect competition; it is a fact to be investigated, not to be judged, still less considered in relation to human welfare as a whole. If this is so, then economics ceases to be of any practical or human interest. If, as must be granted, the sole justification of leaving economic distribution to competition rests upon considerations of social welfare, what we want to know is how social welfare is concretely affected by competition? This problem cannot be left to the generalities of the moralist; it is part and parcel of the problem of the economist. It is the economist who possesses the data upon which any judgment of our economic system must be based. He need not judge them himself, but he must put his data in a form which is significant to the statesman or the moralist.

He must provide materials for reasonable judgment and reasonable action. It is absurd for the economist to study the actions of men in regard to wealth and the results of those actions, and not be able to arrive at any facts which we can say are "good" or "bad," "just" or "unjust," "expedient" or "inexpedient." "Under a system of perfect industrial competition the general rate of wages would be so adjusted that the demand for labour would be just equal to the supply at that rate." What does this conclusion of the professor tell us about wages that is, I need not say of human, but of any interest at all? The

economic relations of men are a part, and a very important (some philosophers would say the most important) part, of the general sociological problem. If the economist fails to give the materials for the answer to the questions the sociologist puts to him, then, indeed, his science is not only dismal, but inconceivably sterile and impotent. The professor indulges in some very general and superficial observations about Socialism, but the great distinction of socialistic literature of the best kind—Karl Marx's *Capital*, for instance—is that it does concentrate itself on the significant aspects of "industrial competition:" these aspects may be partial and coloured, but they are aspects of the right kind, and at any rate expressed in terms of human and social "weal or woe." In other words, the economist must bring sentiment (in the best sense, not sentimentalism) to his investigation of economic phenomena; he must be continually translating his results into, not their mathematical, but their human equivalents. *Homo sum: nihil humani alienum a me puto*. Mr. Charles Booth, for instance, has probably made a more real contribution to Political Economy than all the text-books put together, and all their weary manipulation of bloodless abstractions; he has seen the relevancy of economic facts, or, indeed, he has shown us all the economic fact—for he has clothed it in flesh and blood, as Professor Walker puts it. And in another way Ruskin and Morris have been in spirit at least economists of the highest order, or (let us save ourselves by saying) of the highest perception.

I think, therefore, that Professor Nicholson's book is a rather more than usually unfruitful specimen of an unfruitful kind. At the same time, his work is very able and exceedingly luminous of its kind, and its style seems to me admirable. His introduction, for instance, is often particularly happy in clearing the way for a learner. I would refer in particular to the excellent account of the way in which it is shown that the prominent aspect of the term "wealth" is different in different departments of the subject (p. 9), as also of the distinction that must be drawn between different kinds of "law" as used in Political Economy—"varying in force from the laws of nature to the opinion of dead men." The way in which the question of method is dismissed seems equally admirable. There are quite a number of good things up and down the book; and no one can help feeling the stimulus of being in contact with a sincere, a robust, and an incisive intellect.

SIDNEY BALL.

NOTES AND MEMORANDA.

REPORT OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN LABOUR COMMISSION. — The Labour Commission issued its report on the eve of the meeting of Parliament, after an investigation extending over fifteen months. The *Economic Review* has already published some account of the evidence taken before the Commission : fifty-four places have been visited, and six hundred and twenty-two witnesses have been examined. The Commission finds that the want of farm labour, both in quantity and quality, is acutely felt in the Western Province, so much so that several thousands of labourers could be absorbed ; Cape Town alone could absorb a considerable number of labourers immediately. The supply of female domestic servants is also deficient in the same area, and the quality is unsatisfactory. There is also some deficiency, but not to the same extent, in other parts. The chief sources for farm and other labour are Tembuland, Griqualand East, and Herschel. The fundamental cause of the insufficiency is found in the conditions of life and population, the influence of the immoderate use of liquor, whether brandy, wine, or native beer ; while dagga, which is smoked by natives, has an even worse effect. The development of mining and other industries diverts labour from the farms, and farmers compete, especially in the West, for the remaining supplies. Consequently, says the Commission, the high rate of wages renders it unnecessary for labourers to work more than half their time. I have already given specimens of what this “high rate of wages” is, and therefore should attribute the fact that labourers find it unnecessary to work more than half their time rather to the low standard of living which prevails. The Commission deprecates the encouragement by the railway department of holiday-making, as tending to interfere with the regularity of work. Other causes of the insufficiency mentioned are cheap fares for labourers proceeding to the Transvaal gold-mines, and the shortening of hours of work in the railway department, neither of which, to the mind of an impartial person, seems to reflect any discredit on that department, though the Commission rightly blames it for allowing the sale of drink to natives along the railway lines, and the harbouring of

vagrants in railway cottages. The attractions of town life in the way of dissipation are also given among the causes of scarcity.

Turning to the supply, it appears that a large number of men leave Tembuland, the Transkeian territory, and East Griqualand for other parts for work, of whom about half go to the Colony, and a third to the Transvaal. From these places about fourteen thousand seem to have found work in the Colony in 1893. Natives prefer to go in large parties in charge of a headman. They do not like what they hear about farm service in the West, though many go to the docks and other public works, which is what might be expected from the evidence already summarized. They prefer their accustomed vegetarian diet to fish and other diet offered by farmers. There was (as I have already said) much conflicting evidence about the effect of too much education, of misdirected education, and of absolute want of education on the labour supply. The Superintendent-General of Education is making inquiries as to the seasons when children's labour is of service to the farmers, with a view to fixing the times of school holidays. Although wages in cash, or its equivalent in stock, are from ten shillings a month upwards, when all is calculated, the total is often considerably above three pounds a month. The Commission commends the system of housing adopted by the Cape Town Docks and De Beers Mines.

The Commission suggests, with regard to the liquor question, that local and tentative permissive legislation should be allowed in the extension of the Transkeian prohibition to a wider area in the Colony, or the adoption of the Free State principle; such a course would not be too much in advance of the moral sense of the community to be capable of enforcement. The suggestion is formulated thus: "That licensing courts should have power to insert in all licenses a provision making it illegal to sell liquor to any specified class or classes except under restrictions allowed by the court. Some degree of local option is suggested, as well as the curtailment of hours during which liquor shall be allowed to be sold to natives, and the prohibition of sale or delivery to children. Dagga should be treated as a noxious weed, and exterminated, and its possession made penal."

A labour bureau under a responsible ministerial department is recommended, under which subordinate agencies (civil servants) within the Colony might serve immediate requirements. It is doubted whether an attempt to increase the supply of labour by bringing labourers from the Transkei and elsewhere within the Colony to the Western Province would be successful, and consequently the Commission recommends a supply from outside the Colony, naming Kroomen from Liberia, natives from Inhambane, and, if the matter can be arranged with the German

authorities, Damaras from the German protectorate on the West Coast. It is strongly opposed to the introduction of Asiatics, notwithstanding the comparative cheapness of coolie labour in Natal.

With regard to European immigration, the Commission does not recommend the Government to encourage males to settle in the Colony on account of the want of demand for them. But women-servants should receive State aid towards immigration, with provision for returning the money advanced if they do not fulfil their engagements, or if they marry within a limited time. In this connection I may mention the imperative need there is for those in a position to do so in England, to impress upon intending emigrants the necessity of having proper information regarding their prospects of work in the country to which they are going ; men come here in complete ignorance of the state of their trade in the Colony, or, worse still, without a trade at all.

There are other minor recommendations in regard to the size of private native locations, and the administration of Masters and Servants Acts ; St. Helena is suggested as a convict prison, especially for Kafirs sentenced to long terms of imprisonment for stock thefts. One recommendation, that of giving individual instead of tribal titles to land in the Eastern and Transkeian territories, is opposed to the views held by most public men who are distinguished for the advocacy of sympathetic treatment of natives ; it is made on the ground that the Commission considers it would promote higher wants and civilization. Education should be more practical.

On the much-vexed question of "poor whites," the one thing needful is to bring about self-respect, self-help, self-reliance, and self-betterment. Begging, and what leads to it, should be sternly repressed by public opinion and private practice ; for everybody in this country, not physically incapacitated, can obtain an honest living by work if he pleases. The Government should give this class employment in public works, and they should be induced to go to where there is a demand for their services. For the children of this class, education to fit them for their future life by means of industrial institutions, town schools, night schools, apprenticeship to trades, and bonuses therewith, is recommended.

In regard to the whole labour problem, the Commission concludes that whatever a Government can do, it can have but a partial effect in this matter, which for the most part requires the direct influence of individual upon individual. Greater attention as a social duty to this personal influence, with the definite object in each case of drawing out the better qualities of the individual by kindness, by care, by justice, and by not forgetting discipline, will do more towards effecting a

radical improvement than anything the Commission can recommend or Government carry out.

On the whole, considering the composition of the Commission since its reconstruction, the report is more valuable than might have been expected : that a Commission containing a majority of Bondmen should issue a report containing sound recommendations like those on the liquor question is something to be thankful for. And the conclusion of the report is in the right direction in advocating individual influence rather than undue reliance on Government and legislation. It is to be hoped that this exhortation will have due weight with those whom it chiefly concerns.

V. T. KIRBY.

PROVIDENT COLLECTING BANKS.—A great deal of interest is being shown in many places in that system of helping the poor to acquire habits of thrift which is known by the name of "Collecting Banks." It is because many practical people believe that in this system lies one little bit of an answer to the great problem of our day, viz. the condition of the poor in our big towns, that I venture to think a sketch of the method employed and the practical good that has been found to follow may be of service to the readers of the *Economic Review*.

Among the advantages a district gains from the working of a Collecting Bank, I might mention the gradual training in habits of punctual practical service of a band of workers ; for many will undertake provident collecting who shrink from more directly religious work. I might enlarge again upon the access to some homes closed or unwillingly opened to clergy and district visitors. But what I wish specially to bring before the notice of my readers is the advantage of provident collecting in dealing with the difficulties of those who work at what are known as season trades, where the greater part of the earnings of the year are gathered in during a few months or even weeks. Then, indeed, we fare sumptuously ; we eat and drink of the best ; we buy smart clothes,—true they are meant more for show than for use, but what matter the flimsiness of the texture if the cut be fashionable and the ostrich feathers stand up high enough to amaze the beholder ?—we buy gorgeous antimacassars and ornaments for our mantelpieces fearsome to look upon ; we take the children to the pantomime, if our trade is brisk in winter, or to the seaside, if summer is our good time ; we buy jewellery to a great extent : "rings come in so handy when work is slack," said the wife of one of our poorest street hawkers, whose children feed, in bad times, on the shellfish that

will not keep good, for purposes of trade, more than a week or two in the stuffy back room. It is all extremes with vast numbers of our poor—reckless indulgence or bitter need. What is wanted is to spread the earnings over the whole year, and to keep a little back for bad years and times of special need. The Collecting Bank helps to do this better than any other agency I know of. To a great extent the pawnshop is the poor man's bank, but what a miserable return he gets for his investments there! True, there are penny banks not far from any one, and for children too there are opportunities of saving in our schools. But what a small proportion of grown-up people belong to savings banks! It is often difficult for poor mothers to get out when the banks are open, and with whatever good intentions the money may have been put by upon the mantelpiece, or in the teapot, it is sure to melt. It may be said we spoil the people by taking the bank round to them, and that they ought to care enough to take the trouble to go to it themselves. Ah! but it is just because they do *not* care to save, and can hardly believe that it is possible to save anything worth saving, that we have to step in between them and the consequences of the selfish indifference and neglect of bygone generations of rich and prosperous neighbours, of priests and Levites who have passed by on the other side in endless and almost unbroken procession. And as it is with regard to thrift, so with regard to other departments of right living. We understand the advantages of education, and perhaps deny ourselves daily that we may give them to our children; but for the majority of the poor, compulsion is necessary. So with religion: we must take the Church to the people if we would have them worship there. I think people often fail to consider what has been termed "the absence of margin" in the lives of the very poor as compared with others; the absence of margin for such faults as a perverse temper, feebleness of purpose, changeableness, want of tact, craving for excitement. Such defects weigh one down heavily in any rank of life, but to the poor they are simply ruinous; for between their lives and the great sea of hopeless failure there is such a narrow margin. Such a narrow margin, too, for misfortune; and the misfortunes that dog the footsteps of the poor are so many and so cruel. Two things we want specially to bear in mind—

(1) That the difficulties of the poor are endless, and therefore our patience with their shortcomings must be endless too.

(2) That, in spite of difficulties, they could put by for a rainy day much more than they do, and our duty is to help them to do this. This is evident from the fact that in some poor parishes, where provident collecting has been carried on for some time, several hundreds of

pounds are yearly put by in this way. In one parish that I know of the deposits have reached the sum of over £1700 a year.

A Collecting Bank is a great object-lesson in the art of saving. It is better than a blanket or a shoe club, for it involves the actual handling of money, with the freedom and the responsibility that this entails. As the tiny sum grows and grows, a sense of security creeps into the life; there is something to fall back upon, a possibility of meeting an emergency without being crushed by it. One day, on my collecting round, I was greeted by a very earnest entreaty: would I for once pay out the money—only 6s. it was—upon the card, without the usual week's notice of withdrawal? The husband's sick club had made an alteration in the rules without his knowledge, the quarterly payment of 6s. 6d. was due a month or two earlier than had been expected, and there was no other way of meeting it. The decent, tidy woman had such a look of anxiety, "he would be scratched," she feared. Of course I paid the money, and her gratitude was touching. Sometimes the savings are needed for boots, or to fit out a girl for service, or to pay the rent when the man is out of work, or to meet the expenses of a confinement. I can truly say I have had more gratitude shown me for going round in all weathers collecting, than for anything else I have done for our poor folk, gratitude which took an embarrassing shape in one case, when a woman, to whom I had just paid out her first savings, said, "And what, ma'am, am I to give you out of it for your trouble?" Another woman said to a collector, "Why, it seems quite like a gift, only it's better than a gift, there's such a *relish* with it."

To illustrate the second point, that the poor could save more than they do, I will mention a case which has come under my own observation during the past year. A young working man whom I know very well, and who treats me to that rare proof of confidence—a sight from time to time of his wage-book—began last year to save in real earnest. He is that rare creature in the East End, a bachelor of 24 years old. "Marry, and bring up a family in one room! I'd rather drown myself," he says with cheerful frankness. He managed to save, during 1893, nearly £25, big sums in the Post-office, and small ones in our bank. Yet he paid 10s. a week for lodging and partial board in his father's house, he kept up several club subscriptions, and, his parents being worn-out, sickly folk, and very poor, he sometimes paid his father's sick club subscription too, took him for a fortnight's trip into the country, and paid for an extra week at a Convalescent Home for his mother; and all this, besides buying a complete outfit of good clothes and sundry articles of jewellery, and indulging in quite as much beer and tobacco as is good for him, besides the other delights of young

London, "friendly leads," music halls, funerals, theatres, and meetings in Trafalgar Square.

With regard to the practical working of a Collecting Bank nothing could be simpler. All that is wanted is tact and method. Collectors must go round at a convenient time, and, as far as possible, at the same time, week by week, and, if unable to go, must find a substitute. As a rule Monday morning is the best time, avoiding the dinner hour. Monday afternoon is sacred to mothers' meetings, and though Tuesday suits some people better than Monday, later in the week is apt to result in disappointment. All our successful collectors go regularly, at the same time, week by week, and most of them meet on the doorsteps the "Rent lady" and the "Burial Club gentleman" on their punctual rounds, and perhaps snatch a penny or two from the latter's clutches. A collector calling in the evening, or, better still, visiting the clubs and factories, would have a good chance of securing something from the men and the working girls, and I know some find this plan very successful.

Each collector must be armed with a book, an indelible pencil, and a little bag for the money. The book should have divisions for the amounts deposited on each week of each month, and also for monthly totals deposited and withdrawn, and for the balance carried on to the next year. Each page has a depositor's name, and address, and number, the last corresponding with that on the card, which the depositor keeps; the collector must see the card each week, and put the amount down on that and in the book. At the bottom of each card the rules are printed, which vary slightly in different banks, but are always very few and simple. It is better to allow no interest, as probably a good many years would elapse before more than enough for printing expenses could be gained, and depositors should be led on to place their savings in the Post-office as soon as they reach a sum large enough to gain interest there. There should be two treasurers, to whom the amounts collected should be handed monthly.

As to tact, a smiling countenance and a pleasing and polite demeanour were found serviceable adjuncts to the pistol with which the "gentlemen of the road" of olden times used to point their demand for "your money or your life;" and we Provident Collectors, who may claim to be the spiritual children of those gallant highwaymen, may well learn a lesson in deportment from their experience.

MINNA MACE.

"REPORT OF THE CHIEF REGISTRAR OF FRIENDLY SOCIETIES FOR 1893."—The present volume of these reports, the most authoritative

source of information on social subjects in this country, appears to depart from the custom of its predecessors in being strictly confined to the year to which it relates, instead of being brought up to the date of its presentation,—a practice strictly regular, no doubt, but which is likely to be more appreciated for historical purposes than for present use. A valuable innovation consists in the references to private bills submitted to the Chief Registrar for observation, stating the tenor of his advice upon them. The consideration of such bills represents a by no means unimportant function exercised by the Chief Registrar, outside of his statutory duties, but which had hitherto been considered as confidential. Seven bills appear to have been thus referred to the Chief Registrar in 1893, consisting of a gas company bill, two railway bills, three corporation bills, and a building society bill. The total of new societies and branches registered or certified fell off in the year by 34, but this is sufficiently accounted for by the tendency of legislation relating to both Building and Industrial and Provident (Co-operative) societies. The following table shows the comparative results for 1892 and 1893 :—

	Friendly Societies Acts.			Ind. and Prov.	Build. Soc.	Trade Un.	Cert. Loc. Sc. & Lit.	
	Fr. Socs.	Prov. Socs.	Other Socs.	Soc. Acts. Socs.	Acts. Socs.	Acts. Socs.	Soc. Socs.	
1892 ..	179	440	63	107	100	48	8	8
1893 =	179	+ 468	+ 84	- 92	- 51	+ 66	+ 12	- 3

As respects Friendly societies and branches registered, the proportion of those not subject to valuation decreased by 5 per cent., amounting to 59 instead of 64 per cent. in the previous year. The "Rechabites" and "Manchester Unity" still head the list among the orders as respects the number of new branches registered, the "Foresters" retaining the fourth place. Six out of thirty-nine orders which registered new branches were Temperance orders, and "the activity of the Temperance orders in registering new branches is nearly three times as great as that of the other orders" (it should, however, be borne in mind that the former branches are generally small in numbers of members). There is an interesting account of a special meeting held by authority of the Chief Registrar, of one of the collecting societies of the second rank, the "Liverpool United Legal," which appears to have been ably presided over by the law clerk to the Friendly Societies Registry Office, Mr. Barlow; and the Chief Registrar makes valuable observations on provision for old age and the burial insurance of children. As respects Industrial and Provident societies, we find that there were 35 productive as against 40 distributive registered (in the previous year they had been 30 as against 50) showing the existence of a strong movement towards co-operative production. Returns have been

successfully enforced from registered trade-unions, the number received rising from 355 to 426, with the result of showing an increased mean income of £1 9s. 10d. per member, instead of £1 5s. 2d., but a diminished mean of funds of £1 9s. 6d. per member instead of £1 10s. 3d. Of the new-trade unions registered only two were unions of employers. On Building societies the Chief Registrar observes that "the promoters' societies continue to form the majority of societies established, but are not nearly so numerous as in former years." He gives an instance of one of the processes employed in the manufacture of such societies, in the shape of a ready-printed set of minutes for the first meeting of the promoters, with the necessary blanks—such blanks not including a payment of £48 to the manufacturer for "the necessary printing matter" when "the first 250 members have been enrolled," and, at the same period, "ten guineas . . . as the society's royalty for use of his copyright, rules, and guidance." Among the appendices the Chief Registrar draws "particular attention" to the communications of Dr. J. N. Kursteiner of Gais, on the progress of the movement for State insurance in Switzerland.

J. M. LUDLOW.

THE DWELLINGS OF THE POOR.—This Report of the Mansion House Council for 1893 consists of eighty-six pages. Four pages are occupied with the report of the Council itself, in which an estimate, rather than a summary, of the year's work is given, and almost the whole of the rest of the little book is filled with the reports of the Local Committees and notes thereon, which vary in fulness and value from one report of five lines in the case of North Marylebone, to one of sixteen pages in the case of St. Saviour's, Southwark.

The first thing which strikes any one who glances at the two pages devoted to finance is the encouraging fact that there are the names of only two clergymen out of a total of sixty-four contributors, and that £207 out of the £209 subscribed is given by lay people. But another fact, the reverse of encouraging, which the balance sheet reveals is this—that the expenses of the Committee for 1893 were £740, while the receipts were subscriptions £209, and interest on investments £135. A deficit of nearly £400 on an annual expenditure of £740 gives point to the appeal on behalf of this fund which appeared in the leading London daily papers early in August.

The Council does not propose any new or striking plan of reform, but where occupiers are too timid—often with good reason—or too ignorant and indifferent to complain to their landlords or to the sanitary authorities concerning flagrant evils, it investigates and undertakes the

task of complaint and action. The Report quotes the remark of one poor woman, as a specimen of many others, when an agent of the Council visited her house to see what had been done, "God bless the good gentleman for seeing to it."

The following extract gives a good idea of the Council's practical work :—

"We may mention eighty houses in Beckett Street, Kensington, which, after being under consideration and attention for many months, have been transformed from one of the worst streets in South London, into a thoroughly healthy district.

"In another instance we were instrumental in getting a water supply laid on to fourteen houses in a court which had been supplied previously from a pump in the central area, and, in addition, small feed cisterns were fitted to the closets, and bell-trap gullies replaced by syphons.

"On inspecting a workshop in East London it was found that the water-closet was placed in the work-room, but after our interference a part of the room was cut off, and now forms a small yard between the two."

I cull the following from the reports of the Local Committees, as specially important :—

(1) "It is doubtful whether *any* sanitary staff can deal at all adequately with the nuisance difficulty in the face of extensive overcrowding. Overcrowding is. . . the greatest evil of East End life at the present time" (Bethnal Green Com.).

(2) "There should be at least one inspector for every twelve thousand persons in the parish—*i.e.* about four times as many as exist at present" (Hampstead and St. Pancras Com.).

(3) "The law must make it illegal to erect any dwelling of a greater height than the width of the street, and without ample air-space at rear. *Slum-making is now quite lawful*" (Bloomsbury Com.).

(4) "Against the landlord there is no right of action unless when the house was taken he warranted it to be fit for habitation" (p. 47).

The account of the Cyprus Drainage Scandal in East Ham, pp. 73–79, is well worth careful reading.

JOHN BULLOCK.

"LABOUR CO-PARTNERSHIP."—The first two numbers (August and September, 1894) of this new periodical, "established to advocate co-operative production based on the co-partnership of the worker," and edited, it is understood, by Mr. A. Williams, Treasurer of the Labour Association, and joint author of an article which headed the July

number of this *Review*, form a valuable addition to social literature. The aims of the publication are set forth in a paragraph which is to stand at the head of every number, from which the following may be here extracted :—

“ We advocate . . . the co-partnership, that is, the equal partnership of Labour and Capital, the system under which, in the first place, a substantial and known share of the profit of a business belongs to the workers in it, not by right of any shares they may hold, or any other title, but simply by right of the labour they have contributed to make the profit; and, in the second place, every worker is at liberty to invest his profit, or any other savings, in shares of the society or company, and so become a member entitled to vote on the affairs of the body which employs him. This system is no mere dream. It is already carried out by manufacturing businesses which, at the end of 1893, numbered 109; had a capital of £639,844; sold in the year £1,292,550 worth of goods; made a net profit of £64,679 (after deducting losses of £2,984 made by a few of them); and paid to labour a sum not easily ascertained, but exceeding £8,283, as labour's share of the results over and above standard wages.”

The first number contains articles by Mr. Holyoake and Mr. Greening, and both numbers are full of interesting matter. From the amount of advertisements contributed by co-operative bodies, there seems every hope that “Labour Co-partnership” will meet from them with the support which it deserves.

J. M. LUDLOW.

CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES IN GERMANY.¹—Co-operation keeps spreading in the country of Schulze-Delitzsch, whose able successor, the present president of the Union of German Co-operative Associations formed under the rules sanctioned by Schulze-Delitzsch, in this volume presents his annual report, marked, as usual, by scrupulous care and impartiality. The pity is that, with so painstaking an actuary to sift and order statistics, co-operative societies of other unions should still show themselves so very remiss in sending in their particular reports. A full report reviewing the transactions of all co-operative societies could not fail to be a most interesting publication. The total number of co-operative associations registered in Germany has increased from May 31, 1892 to May 31, 1893, from 8921 to 9934. There is growth observable in all categories. Credit associations have increased from 4791 to 5489, the Raiffeisen associations once more heading the roll of new additions; supply associations have multiplied from 1283 to 1339, building societies from 77 to 101, and societies connected with peculiar trades from 2770 to 3005. The last-named class include 100 productive

¹ *Jahresbericht für 1893 Deutscher Erwerbs- und Wirthschafts genossenschaften.* Von Dr. F. Schenck. [160 pp. 12s. Klinkhardt. Leipzig, 1894.]

societies, societies for the collective purchase of raw material, societies maintaining warehouses for the sale of manufactured goods, insurance societies, and some others. The credit associations occupy, as always in Germany, the position of greatest importance. However, only 1038 of these, including the 946 of Dr. Schenck's own union, have furnished reports of business done. These 1038 between them comprise 502,184 members ; their aggregate capital and reserve amount to about £7,400,000. They have in the twelvemonth lent out more than £75,000,000, and on that business sustained a loss of only £50,000, that is, $\frac{1}{28}$ per cent., two shillings per member. These are very encouraging figures, and should help to call attention in this country to a form of co-operation which, among ourselves, has thus far been strangely neglected.

HENRY W. WOLFF.

LEGISLATION, PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES, AND OFFICIAL RETURNS.

The Finance Act, 1894 (57 & 58 Vict., chap. 30, 4to, 34 pp., 5*d.*, postage 1*d.*), was so long before the public in the form of the Finance or Budget Bill that to mention it here seems almost like trespassing on the domain of ancient history. As it remains with us, however, the most important legislative product of the last session of parliament, it may be as well to consider calmly what are its chief provisions, apart altogether from the more debated question what they ought to have been.

The main principle of part i., which alone deals with the death duties, is simple enough. It is that on the death of any person a duty called the "estate duty" shall be levied upon the whole property of that person according to the following scale. When the value of the estate is—

				Per cent.
Over £1,000,000	8
" 500,000, but not over £1,000,000	..			7½
" 250,000	"	500,000	..	7
" 150,000	"	250,000	..	6½
" 100,000	"	150,000	..	6
" 75,000	"	100,000	..	5½
" 50,000	"	75,000	..	5
" 25,000	"	50,000	..	4½
" 10,000	"	25,000	..	4
" 1,000	"	10,000	..	3
" 500	"	1,000	..	2
" 100	"	500	..	1

This duty is in substitution for the probate duty of 3 per cent. on personal property devised by will, for the additional succession duty imposed on other property in 1888 (¾ per cent. in the case of lineals, and 1½ per cent. in all other cases), and for the 1 per cent. estate duty imposed in the same year on properties exceeding £10,000. It does not, of course, supersede the legacy duty nor the old succession duty, which are payable by the legatee or successor according to a scale which varies from 1 per cent. where he is the child or parent of the deceased person to 10 per cent. where he is not a blood relation.

Consequently, if all property had been held in absolute ownership, and if realty had been valued for succession duty and estate duty in the same way as free personalty was valued for probate duty, the effect of the act would have been simply to substitute the scale given above for a scale under which all properties over £10,000 in value paid a uniform rate of 4 per cent. on personalty and $1\frac{1}{2}$ or $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on realty, and all properties under £10,000 (except the minute ones exonerated by a fixed payment) paid 3 per cent. on personalty and $\frac{1}{2}$ or $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on realty. But, as a matter of fact, real property was valued for purposes of the succession duty on altogether different principles from those which were followed in the valuation of personalty for probate duty, and the provision of the act that the new estate duty shall be levied on the principal value of all property has the effect of raising the valuation of real property very considerably. Moreover, this change in the method of valuation applies to the old succession duty, which still remains in existence, as well as to the new estate duty. The principal value of any property is defined as the price which, in the opinion of the commissioners, it would fetch if sold in the open market at the time of the death of the deceased, but "in the case of any agricultural property, where no part of the principal value is due to the expectation of an increased income from such property, the principal value shall not exceed twenty-five times the annual value as assessed under schedule A of the income tax acts." The highly technical and complicated character of the act arises from the numerous difficulties which beset any one who endeavours to decide exactly what the property which passes from the dead to the living is. One great difficulty is overcome by a somewhat rough and ready expedient. When settled property passes for the first time, it is to be subject to the estate duty and 1 per cent. extra. In consideration of this additional 1 per cent. no further duty is to be exacted until the death of a person competent to dispose of the property.

Parts ii. and iii. of the act, devoted to customs and excise, retain the 4*d.* duty on tea, and increase the duty on beer by 6*d.* per barrel of thirty-six gallons and the duty on spirits by 6*d.* per gallon.

Part iv. imposes income tax at 8*d.* in the pound on income chargeable under schedules A, C, D, and E, and at 3*d.* under schedule B. Total exemption is granted to all persons whose incomes do not exceed £160, exemption as regards the first £160 to all whose incomes are over £160 but not more than £400, and exemption as regards the first £100 to all whose incomes are over £400 but not more than £500. In relation to total exemption and the partial exemption which is called abatement, the income of a wife is still

to be treated as forming part of the income of her husband, except in one special case: "Where the total joint income of a husband and wife charged to income tax, by way either of assessment or deduction, does not exceed £500, and upon any claim under this section the commissioners for the general purposes of the acts relating to income tax are satisfied that such total income includes profits of the wife derived from any profession, employment or vocation chargeable under schedule D, or from any office or employment of profit chargeable under schedule E, they shall deal with such claim as if it were a claim for exemption or relief or abatement, as the case may be, in respect of such profits of the wife, and a separate claim, on the part of the husband, for exemption or relief or abatement in respect of the rest of such total income." Income from land is to be taken as seven-eighths of the assessment, and income from houses as five-sixths of the assessment.

Part v., headed "Miscellaneous," extends to foreign governments the privilege of compounding for stamp duties chargeable on transfers of stocks inscribed in the books of the Bank of England.

Part vi. sweeps away the financial arrangements of the Imperial Defence Act, 1888, and the Naval Defence Acts, 1889 and 1893, and makes the debt contracted under those acts a part of the main body of the national debt, instead of a special fund to be liquidated by the application of revenue over and above the £25,000,000 annuity at present appropriated to interest and repayment.

The *Notice of Accidents Act*, 1894 (57 & 58 Vict., chap. 28, 4to, 5 pp., 1d.), applies (1) to the construction, use, working, or repair of any railway, tramway, gas-work, canal, bridge, tunnel, harbour, dock, port, pier, quay, or other work authorized by any local or personal act of parliament; (2) to the construction or repair by means of a scaffolding of any building which exceeds thirty feet in height, or the use or working of any such building in which more than twenty persons not being domestic servants are employed for wages; and (3) to the use or working of any traction engine or other engine or machine worked by steam in the open air. The Board of Trade has power to add to the list any other employment specially dangerous to life or limb in which twenty persons or more, other than domestic servants, are employed by the same employer. When there occurs in one of these employments "any accident which causes to any person employed therein either loss of life or such bodily injury as to prevent him on any one of the three working days next after the occurrence of the accident from being employed for five hours on his ordinary work, his employer shall, as soon as possible, and, in the case of an accident not resulting

in death, not later than six days after the occurrence of the accident, send to the Board of Trade notice in writing of the accident" with all necessary particulars. Where the accident appears of sufficient importance, the Board of Trade may order an inquiry very similar to that which is now held in the case of a railway accident. The act does not apply to any employment which is for the time being regulated by any act of parliament administered by the Home Secretary and his inspectors, and does not supersede or interfere with such notices of accidents as are already required.

The chief conclusions of the *Report from the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Town Improvements (Betterment)* (House of Lords Paper No. (159), fol., 4 pp., 1d.) are as follows: "1. The principle of betterment, in other words, the principle that persons whose property has clearly been increased in market value by an improvement effected by local authorities should specially contribute to the cost of the improvement, is not in itself unjust." (2) The Standing Orders should provide for due notice being given to the persons upon whom a private bill seeks to lay liability to a betterment charge. (3) A reasonable period should be specified in the bill within which the local authority must give notice to each owner of the amount of the charge which it proposes to lay on his property; the length of a reasonable period will vary with the nature of the work and condition of the neighbourhood, but it should not be so short that the effect of the improvement cannot be adequately tested, nor so long as to make the property suffer in its market value by the uncertainty as to the amount of the charge. (4) In default of the owner's acquiescence in the charge proposed by the local authority the amount should be decided by an arbitrator, or, if the owner so desires, by a jury. (5) The costs of the arbitration should be borne by the local authority, unless the amount of betterment charge awarded is equal to or greater than the amount claimed, in which case each party should bear their own costs. (6) "If the owner has property in the immediate neighbourhood which is found to be injured in its market value by the same work, the amount of the injury should be considered in determining the charge to be imposed upon him for improvements." (7) "If the owner is of opinion that the charge exceeds the enhancement of market value due to the public work, he should be entitled to claim that the local authority should purchase the property in question at the value which it bore without regard to any improvement conferred or to be conferred upon it by such work."

The paper entitled *Laundries: Reports of H.M. Inspectors of Factories as to hours of work, dangerous machinery, and sanitary*

condition (Command Paper 7418, fol., 28 pp., 3*d.*, postage 1*d.*), is a somewhat puzzling document. It opens with a letter from Mr. Sprague Oram to the Home Secretary, stating that he forwards "reports from H.M. Inspectors of Factories relative to laundries, of each of which Mr. Johnston, H.M. Deputy Superintending Inspector, has made a *précis* and prepared a general summary." This letter is followed by a short summary, presumably Mr. Johnston's, which refers to a number of reports; and then come sections headed "Miss Abraham" and "Miss Mary M. Paterson," with regard to which it is difficult to discover what is report and what is summary. Then the paper comes suddenly to an end. The nature of the evils disclosed in the reports is sufficiently indicated by Mr. Sprague Oram's recommendation that laundries should be placed under the Factory Acts, in order to secure the fencing of dangerous machinery, efficient ventilation, and regulation of hours.

The Labour Commission publications probably really end with *The Agricultural Labourer*, vol. v., part i., *General Report* (Command Paper 6894—xxv., fol., 173 pp., 2*s.* 1*d.*, postage 4½*d.*), and *Part ii., Miscellaneous Memoranda, Abstracts, and Statistical Tables* (Command Paper 6894—xxiv., fol., 469 pp., 4*s.*, postage 6*d.*). Mr. Little gives some interesting particulars as to the evolution of the plan of the inquiry and the selection of districts to be specially examined, but the main body of his report is, of course, a summary of the reports of the assistant commissioners which have been noticed from time to time in these pages as they appeared. Unlike the assistant commissioners, however, he is able to use the whole of the statistics obtained by the census of 1891, and he notices how curiously in several respects these statistics conflict with the general impressions of farmers, labourers, and others. The extracts from the reports of earlier commissions, given in part ii., show that some of these impressions prevailed just as strongly twenty and twenty-five years ago as they do to-day, and suggest that they are founded on that curious bias in favour of the past which characterizes the majority of mankind. In instituting the Agricultural Labourer inquiry, the Labour Commission, which was appointed to examine and report on the causes of recent disputes between employers and employed, strayed rather far from the matters referred to it, but no part of its work has been more successful. If it does not lead to much immediate result, it will, at any rate, be of the greatest value to historians in the future as a careful and detailed picture of the economic circumstances of the agricultural population in 1891. Mr. Little is to be congratulated, both on the efficiency of the plan

and the ability and energy of the assistant commissioners selected to carry it out.

The *Report of the Chief Labour Correspondent of the Board of Trade on the Strikes and Lock-outs of 1892* (Command Paper 7403, fol., 408 pp., 3s. 3d., postage 6d.) appears not very much later in 1894 than its predecessor in 1893, and is largely reduced in bulk by the omission of the long and somewhat irrelevant general review which has hitherto been prefixed to it. There were recorded only 692 strikes in 1892, against 893 in 1891, but the number of persons engaged and the average loss of time per person were both larger. The following table applies to those strikes in each of the last four years with regard to which the number of persons engaged were known :—

	1889.	1890.	1891.	1892.
Successful strikers	93,524	213,867	68,247	48,852
Partially successful strikers ..	177,476	66,029	98,127	113,414
Unsuccessful strikers	40,472	101,902	92,763	70,978
Unclassified strikers	10,528	11,183	7,748	3,554
Total ..	322,000	392,981	266,885	236,798

The partial successes were generally so very far removed from complete success that, on the whole, the result of the year's strikes was decidedly unfavourable to the strikers. The lock-outs numbered only eight, the word being used in a very narrow sense, and not in what would, as is suggested, be the most logical and convenient sense "a suspension of work resulting from dispute originating in some demand of the employer" as opposed to a strike, which would be "a suspension of work resulting from a dispute originating in some demand of the employed."

The Board of Trade *Reports on the Volume and Effects of Recent Immigration from Eastern Europe into the United Kingdom* (Command Paper 7406, 8vo, 218 pp., 1s., postage 3d.) comprise a short "Statistical Report" (pp. 1-22), by Mr. J. G. Willis, and a "Report" or "Memorandum" prepared by the Labour Department. Mr. Willis begins with an account of the methods followed by the Board of Trade in endeavouring to collect information as to the origin, number, and destination of immigrants from Europe, and gives a summary of the results arrived at in the recent years during which the system has been in full operation. He then quotes many of the figures relating to the number of foreigners obtained in the last three censuses. His treatment of these figures is not altogether satisfactory. "There are reasons for believing that the number of foreigners was

somewhat understated at the enumeration of 1871 and of 1881, and overstated in 1891." The reason for the difference between the first two of these censuses and the last Mr. Willis does not explain, but it consists simply, as readers of this *Review* are aware,¹ in the fact that, until the census of 1891, successive Registrar Generals considered themselves at liberty to "correct" (and that without any warning to the public) the returns made to them by treating every foreign-born person with an English-looking name as a British subject. Mr. Willis declares that there are no means of measuring and allowing for the error introduced by this cause. As a matter of fact, it would have been easy enough for the compilers of the 1891 census to have made an approximate estimate of the number of foreign-born persons enumerated in 1891 who would have been "corrected" into British subjects as bearing English-looking names, if the system of 1881 had been followed. The Board of Trade ought to have insisted on this being done. In comparing the number of foreigners in the United Kingdom with the number in other countries, Mr. Willis seems to make no allowance for the fact that, in several of these countries, the term includes many persons born within the country. To quote the French figures for 1886, instead of those for 1891, which had already been published last summer, is somewhat careless. No attempt is made to estimate the amount of annual immigration necessary to maintain, or to increase at a given rate, the strength of the foreign colony in the United Kingdom, and so the Board of Trade's statistics of immigration are not in any way brought into relation and comparison with the census figures.

The Labour Department's Report consists of four parts. Parts i. and iv. contain a review by the Chief Commissioner, Mr. Llewellyn Smith, of the general character and effects of the influx. Part ii., also by Mr. Smith, is an account of recent changes in the organization of the boot and shoe making industry, and of the part played in it by Jewish immigrants. Part iii., by Miss Collet, deals with women's labour as affected by immigration. The reason for the selection of the boot-making trade is explained on p. 65. "The industrial position of foreigners in the clothing [and furnishing?] trades in 1888-90 was dealt with by the Lords' Committee on Sweating, and also less elaborately by the House of Commons Committee on Immigration and Emigration in 1888. It was also the subject of a memorandum by the Labour Correspondent of the Board of Trade in 1887." (Mr. Smith should really have remembered that he has acute, not to say captious, critics before he attributed prophetic powers to

¹ See *Economic Review*, April, 1894, p. 272.

Mr. Burnett in this way.) "Moreover, it was carefully investigated about the same time . . . by Mr. Charles Booth and his co-workers. . . . Since that time, so far as the inquiries of the Labour Department have shown, the methods of organization of the tailoring and furniture trades, the extent and character of the foreign competition in these trades, and the departments of labour which it chiefly affects, have not undergone any sufficient transformation to make it necessary to cover the whole ground again by a fresh detailed inquiry." In the boot and shoe trade, however, "a considerable change has taken place in the organization of the trade in the direction of the substitution of 'indoor labour' in factories and workshops for outdoor labour in small workshops and the homes of the operatives." Miss Collet's report is purely supplemental to the earlier inquiries. The Labour Department *Report* thus really consists of three separate reports, and it would, perhaps, have been better not to have attempted to amalgamate them into a single whole. In the first, or part i., Mr. Smith examines the common accusations brought against the Jewish immigrants that they are paupers, criminal, dirty, and incapable of being Anglicized, and finds surprisingly little ground for most of them. In the second report, or part ii., he shows, in regard to the boot and shoe making trade, how very erroneous is the common belief that the Jewish immigrants have simply pushed themselves into places formerly occupied by English workers, and depressed by their action the wages of all those English workers who have not been ousted. Miss Collet's principal conclusion may be best given in her own words: "Whereas there seemed to be no tendency amongst Jewesses to undersell non-Jewish women, there is evidently a strong desire amongst wholesale clothiers to replace Jewish male labour by non-Jewish female labour as much as possible, a desire which seemed to be due partly to dislike of the Jews, partly to the greater cheapness of female labour, partly to the greater self-assertiveness and persistence in making a good bargain displayed by Jewish men as compared with English girls. If, besides losing the lower class of the ready-made trade by this growth of employment of women in provincial factories, the Jewish tailors were threatened on another side by the competition of Englishmen in the manufacture of the better class, on the system taught them by the Jews, the consequences to the Jewish tailoring trade would be most serious. Nothing but the conservatism of the English tailor prevents him from successfully entering into the field opened up by the Jews."

The *Report by the Board of Supervision to the Secretary of State for Scotland on the Relief of the Able-bodied Unemployed during the*

winter of 1893-4 (Command Paper 7410, fol., 74 pp., 7½d., postage 2½d.), gives details as to measures taken by municipalities and charitable organizations. In Scotland the able-bodied, with the exception of women who have children to nurse, are not entitled to relief, though inspectors are instructed, with grim Scotch humour, that, if a person is really destitute, no long time will elapse before he ceases to be able-bodied. A curious coincidence is remarked between the dissertation on the meaning of the word "unemployed" given in the Board of Trade Report (see *Economic Review*, January, 1894, pp. 122, 123) and that given in the Report of the Dundee Charity Organization Society almost at the same moment.

The *Fifth Report of H.M. Commissioners appointed to carry out a scheme of colonization in the Dominion of Canada of Crofters and Cottars from the Western Highlands and Islands of Scotland* (Command Paper 7445, fol., 10 pp., 1½d.) shows the colonies at Killarney in Manitoba and Saltcoats in the North-West Territory to be still in the debt and difficulties usually found in the early years of settlements of the kind. Sir Charles Tupper, however, after visiting them early in the present year, was still sanguine of ultimate success.

Paraguay is once more the scene of communist experiment. In Mr. Findlay's *Report for 1893 on the General Condition of Paraguay, with some Observations on the New Australia Co-operative Settlement* (Foreign Office Annual Series, No. 1357, 8vo. 26 pp., 5d., postage 1d.) we seem to find ourselves transported back to the days of Robert Owen. "The movement," Mr. Findlay says, "which has resulted in 'the New Australia Co-operative Association' began about two years ago, and originated, as I was informed, in dissatisfaction with the conditions of labour and the land legislation now in force in the Australian colonies. The great Australian strikes, in which the trade-unionists were beaten, brought it many recruits, and it was determined to found a community on co-operative principles, with the object of 'putting into practice, upon a voluntary basis and under the most favourable conditions available, that form of industrial association which will secure justice for all.'" It is not very clear whether the "Basis of Co-operative Organization" given by Mr. Findlay is a copy or only a summary of the fundamental laws of the society. It is somewhat vague. The community is to own "all the means of production in exchange and distribution," and also to conduct "all production in exchange and distribution." It is difficult to say exactly what these terms mean, and their obscurity is intensified by the third rule, which prescribes "superintendence by the community of all labour-saving co-operations." Children are to be maintained by the community

“under guardianship of parents ;” all capital needed is to be saved by the community, and the “remaining wealth production” to be divided equally among all adults “without regard to sex, age, office, or physical or mental capacity.” The old story is repeated. The colonists are told travellers’ tales about the El Dorado to which they are going, and a painful disillusion takes place when they arrive at it. Dissension breaks out, not about the distribution of labour or wealth as the economists would have us expect, but about some vulgar matter quite familiar to individualist society. In this case it is the drink question. The colonists had bound themselves to practise total abstinence for at least three years, and some of them broke the pledge. Expulsions and secessions followed, and, according to the latest information obtained by Mr. Findlay, the colony was rapidly breaking up after an existence of three or four months. Let no one pity these New Australians. Experience in the United States shows that ex-members of communist societies are by no means unsuccessful when they return to the world, and even if it were not a good business training, it must be a pleasant reminiscence to have practised genuine communism for three months.

The Return of the Amounts of British Government Securities held by the several Government Departments and other Public Offices on March 31, 1894 (House of Commons Paper No. 65, fol., 7 pp., 1d.) shows that no less than £103,638,582 consols (out of a total of about £525,000,000), £227,615 2½ per cents. 1905 (out of £4,600,000), £11,778,706 2½ per cents. (out of £32,750,000), and £21,354,838 local loans stock out of £41,000,000) are held by public departments and offices. The magnitude of the figures is rather startling, but it must be remembered that nearly the whole of this property represents money owing to private individuals, or to institutions not in any sense departments of the State, just as much as the rest of the debt. Over fourteen millions of stock are held by the official trustees of charitable funds, about twenty-four represent the investment of suitors’ money by the supreme court of judicature, about seventy-eight millions are held against the liabilities to depositors in the post-office and other savings banks, and of the remainder nearly all is accounted for in substantially similar ways. The Post Office is responsible for the disproportionately large amount of 2½ per cents. and local loans stock held, as it has £36,387,665 consols, £9,079,170 2½ per cents., and £10,977,690 local loans stock.

EDWIN CANNAN.

REVIEWS.

OUTLINES OF ECONOMICS. By RICHARD T. ELY, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Political Economy in the University of Wisconsin. [432 pp. 8vo. \$1.50. Crowell. New York, 1894.]

Professor Ely's new book "is intended primarily for colleges," *i.e.* for junior University students. It is essentially different from his former *Introduction to Political Economy*, which was written for a younger generation of learners; and the difference seems to me to be all to the advantage of the latter. He claims that "this newer work is more theoretical." The chief fault that a critic might have found with the *Introduction* was that it was too miscellaneous. The beginner surely wants a few fundamental ideas clearly driven home. He is generally too young and ignorant to formulate objections of his own; so that the teacher need not, at so early a stage, safeguard himself at every point, or appeal in confirmation to the large stores of miscellaneous information through which he has worked his own way to the conclusions embodied in his book. Thus the earlier teaching should be more theoretical than that which follows. Until he has grasped *some* principles, the student has no standard of judgment to apply to the miscellaneous facts of life; until he is able to reason for himself on a sufficiently large basis, he is incompetent to call in question the principles of preceding investigators. Thus it seems to me that Professor Ely has not done wisely in attempting to make his later book the more theoretical of the two. This is, however, a not very serious fault, for the books are not so radically different in size or in tone as to make it impossible to use them interchangeably. The present fluctuating state of opinion regarding the scope and method of political economy seems to lay every economic writer under the supposed obligation of spending an appreciable portion of his space in an historical introduction. It is to be regretted that this is thought necessary. Economic history is an even younger study than political economy itself, and its conclusions, though likely to be ultimately more permanent, are for the present as liable to revision, if not to refutation, as those of economic theory. Moreover, any highly compressed account

of great movements and succeeding centuries is sure to abound in half truths. It is practically attempting the impossible to deal with the evolution of social life in five and twenty pages. The lessons which it is the object of such a sketch to inculcate had better be left to the professors of history and political science.

In the present divided state of economic opinion, before we can appraise the work of a writer, we must have a clear knowledge of his point of view. Professor Ely's opinions are perhaps almost too well known to be treated in this way; but for the sake of those who may not be acquainted with them, it may be mentioned that he is a very prominent member of the American branch of the Christian Social Union (lately reconstituted under the title of the Church Social Union), and that his reflections on social subjects are such as would be cordially endorsed by all soberer members of that organization on this side of the Atlantic. In noting the profound reliance of the older economists on the regulative power of competition, he reminds us that "their mistake lay in treating it as though it were the only regulative force," whereas "it is only one of a number of forces which balance each other, and if the other forces are removed, competition itself soon disappears" (p. 287). It is this fundamental mistake which leads writers "to consider man simply as a producer of goods," the result of which has been "that men devise with great skill rules by which man may be made the best possible manufacturing machine" (p. 72). A further result has been an over-estimation of the share of produce which falls to the employer, so that economic prosperity has been associated with low wages; whereas "dear labour should be the very *goal* of England's economic effort, for that means abundant supply of the wants of the gross mass of her people; and the fact that labour is dear, so far from being an obstacle to prosperity, is the very proof and substance of that prosperity" (p. 73). But Professor Ely is no socialist in the ordinary meaning of the term. He certainly says roundly that the justification of the continuance of private ownership lies, not in "the fact that I have long owned a thing, and that my father and grandfather owned it before me," but in the affirmative answer to the question whether its existence promotes the welfare of society as a whole, and in the fact that at present it is "the greatest incentive offered to private enterprise" (p. 262). But he fears, as dangerous both to freedom and to civilization, "the domination of a single industrial principle," such as a socialistic state would involve (pp. 312, 313). The fact is that, as he says earlier in the book (p. 76), so-called natural laws are "habits, not compulsory necessities of nature; the laws of life seem to differ from those of inanimate nature in that

they are not quite invariable habits, and that the sciences which deal with man deal with a being who is modified by his environment, *but who*” (the italics are the author’s) “*has the power of modifying that environment by his own conscious effort.*” Such being the case, social reform rather than social revolution seems the aim of the rational economist. Enough has perhaps been said to illustrate the lines of this book. It can be cordially recommended to the general reader as well as to the junior student for whom it was especially written. The thoughtful man of affairs will find on every page food for reflection, and the distinctly Christian philanthropist will welcome a book which so often supplies reasons for the faith that should be in him.

D. J. MEDLEY.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. BY LUIGI COSSA. Revised by the author and translated from the Italian by LOUIS DYER, M.A. [x., 587 pp. Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d. net. Macmillan. London, 1893.]

“The favourable reception of the author’s *Guide to the Study of Political Economy*, translated and published in England and America at the suggestion and under the auspices of the late Professor Jevons, paved the way for an English version of what was begun as a third edition of that work, though it has finally shaped itself into a completely new book.” This extract from the preface is a sufficient explanation of the history of the present volume. It is changed in name, and to a great extent in form: the historical part is greatly expanded, and at the same time rearranged; and a chapter has been added upon “Contemporary Theories of Socialism.” A praiseworthy but not altogether successful attempt has also been made to bring the English translation up to date (Hobhouse’s *Labour Movement*, for example, must have been inserted “at the moment of going to press,” but no reference is made to a book which is both chronologically and logically prior to it—Mrs. Webb’s *Co-operative Movement*). An index of subjects has been added, and the index of authors is enlarged; but Mr. L. L. R. Price is still made to “absorb” all other economists of the same name, except Mr. Bonamy Price—a process of simplification which does not make for clearness.

The great distinction of the original work is, that it is the only book of the kind; but I should hesitate to say that it renders any other book of the kind superfluous. It is a pity that it pretends to be rather more than what it is really useful for—a bibliography, or book of reference for an advanced student. It certainly tends—much too often—to rise or fall into a treatise on the subject. The result is that the treatment

not only fails in "objectivity," but is singularly unequal in method and in value. The first part (called theoretical) is dogmatic, the second part is historical, and the last chapter (on theories of socialism) is controversial. It is the historical part of the book, including as it does a comprehensive survey of the work which has been or is being done in Political Economy throughout the whole world, which is really useful and deserving of gratitude. But even this part is coloured by the author's bias. He writes entirely from the standpoint of the classical school of Political Economy—that is, of that Political Economy which Adam Smith "created," Ricardo and Malthus expanded, Mill put into shape, and Marshall has systematized and developed up to date. If this conception of the subject is flattering to Englishmen, it does not altogether satisfy completeness of view—at any rate, such completeness of view as we require from an historian. It is from the select heights of this position that Cossa distributes his judgments and "appreciations:" now lamenting the indiscretions and compromises of Mill (who wandered from the true path), at another time rebuking the pretensions of the German historical school ("whose sole idea and engrossing pursuit is detail in history and minutiae of statistics"), or ridiculing anything that partakes of the heresy of socialism. Such a standard of measurement makes his book imperfectly historical. It shows no recognition of the very real contribution that has been made by the historical and socialist schools to Political Economy, viz. in the conception of the historical character of its "categories;" in other words, of the essential relativity of economic explanation to the facts it has to explain. There can be no finality about an explanation of "things which can be otherwise"—of things which are contingent, alterable, and variable. In the list of "introductory" books which Professor Cossa recommends, we miss any such characterization of Political Economy as is given, for instance—and perhaps in its most classical form—by Bagehot's *Postulates of Political Economy*. The total effect of this "Introduction" is to give the untutored reader an entirely exaggerated impression of the fixity and finality of economic conceptions. Though the author is aware of, or at least mentions, the hypothetical character of the science, it frequently "drops out of his reasoning," and we are being continually confronted with such expressions as: "it [Political Economy] studies in the social system of wealth what is typical, *essential, and permanent*" (the italics are ours); "several universally acting laws of economics as formulated by the classical school;" "remember, first of all, that economic laws are irreversible and universal, influencing all men, because all men are members of civil society."

Such a view does not recognize that the industrial system which classical Political Economy presupposes—that is, the modern business world—is gradually but sensibly developing “categories” not dreamt of in its philosophy. Take, as an instance, the phenomenon of “monopolies.” The modern monopolies, or trusts, which the latter-day economist is being forced to take account of, are quite different in everything but the name from the monopolies which Adam Smith attacked: they are no longer from above, but from below; not artificial restrictions of competition, but products of it. Competition, so far from being a permanent condition of things, is rather a process of natural selection, giving rise to forms of organization to which the ordinary “laws of competition” (between individual producers) do not apply, or, at any rate, in the same form. Take, again, the system of “collective bargaining” as developed by trade unions, or by employers’ associations, or any method of securing a “standard” or “living wage;” the action of this new “collective” force must be taken account of by the economist, and it is safe to say that modern “business” is still a good deal in advance of Political Economy (cp., for instance, Professor Nicholson’s book, which, while professing to deal with the actual, has not got beyond joint-stock companies!). There is, doubtless, a continuity and unity of substance under these alterations of form; only it must be shown. And we can, at any rate, say that these tendencies, together with the whole energy of State or municipal regulation and administration, are much more significant than the “tendencies” about which the classical political moves in a dismal circle. To which consideration we may add, that in England, at least, the home of the classical school, Political Economy is taking more and more an ethical and sociological character; for Professor Nicholson’s book is a backwater in the main stream. The chief significance of Professor Marshall’s treatise lies in the fact that it reflects a changed or changing problem; that it takes its departure from the causes of poverty, rather than the causes of wealth.

Space hardly permits of a detailed criticism of the original work. The first part of the book lays inordinate stress upon tedious and obsolete controversies; the last part is itself a controversy; and the historical part, though highly useful for purposes of reference, is often unsatisfactory. The characterizations of economists, when they are at all elaborate, are not remarkable for their insight, in some instances more remarkable for the absence of it. The strongest point is, perhaps, the description of mercantilism and its different phases, even if the generalizations are a little questionable. The bibliography of labour and socialistic literature is strikingly inadequate, more

especially as regards England : books of the most unequal value are put together anyhow, while a whole field of significant and sometimes valuable literature is entirely neglected, *e.g.* the Claims of Labour Series, Report of Industrial Remuneration Conference, and Fabian literature generally. The distinctions between French, German, and English latter-day Socialists are not realized at all. The apparent completeness and impartiality which Professor Cossa's book seems to have gained from an inclusion of "Contemporary Theories of Socialism," turns out upon a very slight inspection to be quite illusory, and worse. The statement that no "Christian, be he Protestant or be he Catholic, can possibly be a Socialist," is significant of the author's qualifications to write about the subject at all.

There is still room for a history of Political Economy which shall be strictly impartial and objective : for a history of ideas and theories exhibited in connection with the general thought and sentiment of the time, and still more with the facts which occasioned and to a large extent explain the theories. Held's unfinished work is the only attempt of the kind : suggestions may be found in Toynbee whose significance Cossa unduly depreciates ; and Bonar and Cannan have made important contributions to parts of the problem. The main value of Cossa's book lies, perhaps, in its suggestion of how much better it could be done.

With all its shortcomings, however, the original work contains a great deal of accurate and careful information. But I am afraid that the English edition has not dispensed with the need of reference to the original work, which is indeed often quite indispensable to an understanding of the translation. The first part of the book is bad enough, but it is made infinitely worse by the vagaries of the translation. Cossa's terminology in one particular has fairly baffled the translator ; it is awkward, certainly, but except in one place there does not seem any confusion in the original. The most general term for "Political Economy" is *Economia Politica*. This gives rise to a distinction, upon which the author himself lays great stress, *viz.* Political Economy as a science, *i.e.* "pure economics ;" and Political Economy as an art, *i.e.* "applied economics." To the science he sometimes (after a German precedent) gives the name of *Economia Sociale*, translated as "Social Economics," and defines it (p. 51) as "an abstract science of man's concern with wealth as a social system." To the art he gives the name of *Politica Economica*. Mr. Dyer translates this last term now as "Political Economy," now as "Economic Policy," and again as "Political Economics," to the unspeakable confusion of the reader. For instance, on p. 54, § 3, the author distinguishes the *art* of

Political Economy, or *Politica Economica*, from the *science*, which he has called "Social Economics;" the translator here gives "Political Economy" instead of "Economic Politics," both in the heading and in the text (cp. "confusion between Social Economics and Political Economy"); and this leads up to a paragraph which requires to be put back into the Italian before any meaning can be given to it. The translator, by way of breaking up the long periods of the original, turns a distinction between Political Economy as pure or general science (= Social Economics), and Political Economy as applied or special art (= Economic Politics), into a distinction between "Political Economy as the science" and "Social Economics as the art," and makes the author insist on the need of a separation between "Political Economy" and "Social Economics;" whereas the real distinction is between "Social Economics" and "Economic policy or politics." The expression "Social Economics" doubtless suggests the *art*, but nothing can be clearer than that the author invariably uses its original for the *science*, as distinct from the *art*. The translator's remark, therefore (meant for a translation), on p. 59, that "the phrase Social Economics is used above for the rational, pure, and scientific art (the original has 'part') of economics," carries the confusion still further; and on p. 109 it is all "anyhow," though the author himself (or his printer) seems not altogether innocent of confusion in the last passage. I cannot understand how the "revisers" referred to in the preface could have left the use of terms in this state.

There are some other points in which the translator gives the opposite sense of the original. Mill is credited with the statement that the "inductive" method is the method of Political Economy, as also of the more advanced physical sciences (p. 333): it should be, of course (and is, in the original), "deductive." Nor, again, does Cossa reproach French and Italian economists for their "airy and ill-considered appreciations" of German economics, but for their depreciation (p. 399). And he does not say that Marshall's *Principles* "includes" various monographs, etc., but that "it has been preceded and followed by" them (p. 358). And Walker (p. 479) did not write a work, but an article, on "Business Profits." And lastly (though this does not conclude the list), Cossa certainly does not say (p. 108), that if one subtracts "from Mill, Garnier, and all the rest every erroneous affirmation in religion and morals which their writings contain, the remainder is unchanged, and is *sound* economic doctrine." "Sound" is an insertion of the translator; it should be "mere," or "general."

On the whole, however, the translation is careful and spirited, and must have been an immense labour. Mr. Dyer certainly deserves well

of students of economics. "Regularize" (p. 44), "collective man" (p. 48), "strangers" (p. 132), "industrial fairs," are rather curious.

The reference to Sidgwick (p. 53) seems to require the specification of the particular treatise alluded to (mentioned on p. 101). But those who use the book will doubtless be able and anxious to suggest improvements in detail to the author or translator. I could wish that the execution of the work had been more adequate to its conception.

SIDNEY BALL.

HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH LANDED INTEREST
(MODERN PERIOD). By RUSSELL M. GARNIER. [564 pp.
8vo. 10s. 6d. Sonnenschein. London, 1893.]

When I had occasion to notice the first volume of this book in this *Review*, it was by no means with unqualified approval. Mr. Garnier is a practical land agent, who has made a bold and most useful attempt to bring his working knowledge to the aid of difficulties in old authorities over which students have been puzzling their heads, and disputing with other students equally ignorant of practical agriculture with themselves. He has spared no pains in a thorough study of his authorities, and all the *direct* work in illustration of his subject is of a high character. The chief defect is to be found in the necessary historical and literary training. It does not appear that Mr. Garnier has made any previous essay in literature, and it is a rash thing to begin on so large a subject as he has chosen, or, at any rate, on such an extensive scale. The result is that not infrequently facts and figures are arrayed before us with perfect accuracy, but with a want of that discrimination and proportion with which a practised writer would unfold a difficult and complicated subject to an amateur reader. Mr. Garnier's style, notwithstanding numerous colloquialisms, is too heavy for the uninitiated, though professed students of economics will be grateful for the wide area over which he has travelled. Take, for example, his account of the Corn Laws (pp. 194–205). It is difficult to keep in mind the constant changes in the conditions under which importation and exportation of corn were severally prohibited or allowed. Nor is it, perhaps, necessary to remember them in all their obscure detail. The important points are the attempt of the legislature to regulate the food supply of the country, in the interest, at first, of a political theory, then of a political class; the adjustment of old principles to new conditions by a sliding scale of import duties; and, finally, the absolute surrender of the whole attempt at regulation. A few facts in illustration of each of these positions, and a full chronological table of all the changes, would have left the reader with a

much more definite impression of what the author desired him to remember, than the somewhat overweighted array of facts and principles mixed which, as the text stands, is meant to serve this object.

The mistakes in historical fact are not serious ; but the title of *Duke of Lancaster* (p. 18) was an impossible one under the Norman kings, and for some time later ; the statement (p. 73) that the bailiff, who up to the reign of Edward III. was the president of the Hundred Court, had vanished simultaneously with the introduction of the "County Court," seems to lead no whither, unless the allusion is to the establishment of Quarter Sessions ; while "the repeal of the sumptuary laws" by 1 Jas. I., c. 25, mentioned on p. 81, note 4, leaves us, no doubt falsely, with the impression that the author meant to imply the abandonment of such principles in the future (*vide* Cunningham, *Eng. Ind. and Com.*, ii. 338). These are, however, small blemishes. No future social historian will be able to ignore Mr. Garnier's work ; and the politician will gain not a little by hearing what the practical agriculturist, who is also a student of the past, has to say on such momentous points as the taxation of land, the relative advantages of large and small farming, and many other burning questions.

The interest of the last half of this volume is centred on the mutual jealousy which subsisted for nearly two centuries between the manufacturers and the landowners, from the time when Charles II. gave his land-owning Cavalier Parliament some compensation for their sufferings in allowing them to offer a bounty on the exportation of corn, down to the abolition of the Corn Laws in 1846 and the consequent ruin of the old agricultural supremacy. Indeed, it might almost be said that Mr. Garnier considers himself as holding a brief for the landowners. He certainly states their case with considerable skill and effect. But he is not a landlord's advocate. He attributes the ultimate victory of the capitalists to the want of solidarity between the various classes engaged in agriculture, and consequently welcomes Lord Winchelsea's newly founded scheme for agricultural union. In conclusion, it may be said that, if Mr. Garnier would cut out from his first volume the lengthy discussion about the mark system, and would throughout prune both volumes of their immense and confusing detail, which might be conveniently placed in chronological tables for reference, and would present the whole in one volume of convenient size, he would confer on the general public a boon equal to the obligation under which he has already laid the professed student of economics or of history in general.

D. J. MEDLEY.

PRIMITIVE CIVILIZATIONS; or, Outlines of the History of Ownership in Archaic Communities. By E. J. SIMCOX. [1120 pp. 2 vols. 32s. Sonnenschein. London, 1894.]

The merest glance at Miss Simcox's massive volumes, with their closely printed pages all bristling with facts and references, will fill intending readers with respect for the industry of an authoress who, having already gained her laurels in other fields, is nevertheless minded to persevere until Egypt, Babylonia, and China are at her feet. It was a bold thing, and at the same time a very meritorious one, to venture to put together, in an "eusynoptic" form, the results that the Egyptologist and his brother specialist have hitherto preferred to hide away in impossible monographs and the odd corners of scientific periodicals, merely because the time has not yet come for them to be given an artistically complete and final form. Indeed, so little has been done in the direction of making even the broader facts accessible to the public, that Miss Simcox's labours may fairly claim to rank on a level with first-hand work. The world at large cannot but welcome a book that so instructively points the twofold moral, that there is nothing alarming, but, on the contrary, something well worth studying, in the vastness of the periods through which these "primitive civilizations" lasted, and that the mainsprings of the life of these ancient peoples were very much the same instincts, ideas, and interests that to-day determine our own.

No critic will be inclined to deal harshly with an attempt so gallant to perform so herculean a task; and, indeed, Miss Simcox has nothing to fear if her critics make their acquaintance with the vast subjects that she covers the measure of their severity. "Pure Economists," however, if such there be, and if such be readers of the *Economic Review*, must be warned that the sub-title, *Outlines of the History of Ownership*, is wholly misleading. Perhaps it is Miss Simcox's modesty that makes her try to pass off what is nothing less than an analytic history of the whole social life of certain nations as an essay on the proprietary rights that they recognized. "Ownership in Egypt," for instance, surely constitutes an imperfect advertisement of the contents of book i., when, of its eight sections, two only are devoted to economic subjects, viz. those on the "Economic Order," and "Commerce and Industry," whilst the other six relate to the Monarchy, Caste and Descent, the Military Class, the National Religion, the Civil Law, and the Family. Only a "synoptic" mind, such as Plato might have envied, would see in all these topics the necessary adjuncts of a theory of property.

Indeed, Miss Simcox is at her best when immersed in her material,

at her worst when she tries to stand back from her subject and grasp its general significance and purpose. Her introduction, a matter of thirteen pages, is nicely calculated to deter the more "cranky" scientist from ever glancing at the 1120 pages of the main text. She appears to maintain the heretical doctrine that the savages and barbarians of the present day differ from the ancestors of the civilized races in being "non-progressive," so that we practically cannot argue from one to the other. Such a view was, no doubt, orthodox in the days of Niebuhr,¹ and Arnold;² it already counts as a lamentable oversight in Bagehot;³ and to-day there is simply no excuse for such a theory, as, even in the more popular works on anthropology,⁴ instances are given of genuine progress having taken place amongst savages, whilst the careful study of any typical savage tribe that inhabits one of the chief "areas of characterization" will show it to be steadily, if slowly, advancing along very much the same lines as those on which our own civilization has moved. Here, then, Miss Simcox had better be cautious, and had better refrain from upholding her own way as the only path that leads to the knowledge of the origin of civilization, just because it is one, and a very important, way.

But, after all, a few strokes of the pen will alter these apparent blemishes in the title and introduction; and, meanwhile, the book is to be recommended as a solid piece of useful work, that deserves not only to be read carefully, but to find a permanent place in every library as a book of reference.

R. MARETT.

SOCIALISM AND SOCIAL REFORM. By RICHARD T. ELY, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Political Economy in the University of Wisconsin. [449 pp. Crown 8vo. \$1.50. Crowell. New York, 1894.]

The progress of Socialism in the United States is a phenomenon which can surprise no one who has studied the results of unrestricted private monopoly in that country. "Individualism of the brutal American type," which Amiel, in a fit of pessimism, prophesied would be "the only hope of humanity" after Socialism should have extinguished liberty in Europe, seems to have developed quite legitimately into a plutocracy protected by bribery, and occasionally tempered by armed insurrection. All who have read the hideous

¹ See Lieber's *Reminiscences of Niebuhr* [1835], p. 225.

² See *Life and Correspondence of Arnold* [1845], i. 417.

³ See *Physics and Politics*, p. 115.

⁴ E.g. Farrer's *Primitive Manners and Customs*, p. 185.

account which Mr. Stead has written of municipal and social life at Chicago, must be astonished at the patience of the American democracy under the exactions of capitalists, who seem bent upon proving that, in matters of social justice and real freedom, too far *West* may be *East*. Professor Ely's *Socialism and Social Reform* gives ample evidence both of the backwardness of social legislation in the United States (compare, for instance, his remarks on the hours of labour for women and children, on the "truck" system, and on corrupt practices), and of the increasing revolt against the plutocracy in all classes. The book is written primarily for Americans, but it is intended to be a comprehensive handbook to the whole Socialistic movement. An appendix on the Bibliography of Socialism shows how wide and thorough the author's researches have been in the economic literature of England, France, Germany, Italy, and Holland, as well as of America. He is also well acquainted with the interesting experiments in legislation which are being made in Australia, and especially in New Zealand; and gives references even to works which have appeared in the present year. The book is therefore thoroughly up to date, and may be regarded as the best handbook of the whole subject which has yet appeared.

Professor Ely is careful to insist that his standpoint is "conservative;" but his is not the conservatism of the Liberty and Property Defence League. He considers that Socialism, "which is a theory of monopoly," holds good for monopoly; but that the tendency towards monopoly is by no means so universal as Socialists imagine. This he proves by some interesting facts and figures. He is in favour of the socialization of "natural monopolies" (a term which includes railways, roads, gas, waterworks, etc., but *not* land), and would compensate stock-holders by the issue of Government bonds to the amount of their holdings. Large accumulations should then, he thinks, be broken up by graduated taxation; and no new fortunes would be made, for, as he shows, almost every millionaire owes his position either to monopoly of some kind or other, or to the gains of land-ownership, which he wishes to see separately dealt with by socializing unearned increment.

In his careful criticisms of the Socialist programme, Professor Ely wisely rejects without comment the materialism of Marx and all the extravagancies of Free Love and Anarchism, as having no necessary connection with Socialism. The English reader is thus spared the irrelevant discussions which make Schäffle's *Aussichtslosigkeit* almost unreadable. By taking the *Fabian Essays* as the authorized practical Socialism, Professor Ely is able to present the same, as it should be presented, in its strongest form.

Members of the Christian Social Union will not need to be reminded that Professor Ely is in thorough sympathy with Christian economics. He speaks warmly of the good work done by social and college settlements in England and America, and mentions the *Economic Review* as "the most important of all" English writings "to those who would keep pace with Socialism." The last word is here, of course, used in the wider sense. In the introductory chapter the author cautions us against the vagueness which attaches to it, and quotes several definitions. He might perhaps have found room for Schäffle's important demonstration, that the use of the words Socialism and Individualism is often quite misleading, distributive justice, with its maxim *suum cuique*, being frankly individualistic. Many of the cruder forms of Socialism are, as Mr. J. S. Mackenzie says in his brilliant *Introduction to Social Philosophy*, only "Individualism run mad." This is a caution which is sometimes needed by the rhetoricians of social reform.

In enumerating the weaknesses of Socialism, Professor Ely attaches less importance to the "menace to liberty" than many would do, and gives more prominence to the "concentration of discontent" which would accompany Collectivism. At present, we distribute our righteous indignation over the cook, the milkman, the gas company, the water-works, etc. ; but under Socialism such questions as—

"Who makes the quartern loaf and Luddites rise?
Who fills the butchers' shops with large blue flies?"

would all be answered by "The State!" and grave disaffection would follow. More serious, perhaps, is the danger that some of the higher arts, which can never be appreciated by the populace, would be discouraged or even prohibited.

"The ploughman will despise and scoff
The thing he is not skilful of."

And we are most of us ploughmen, to a certain extent. Another timely reminder is, that competition is not always anti-social in its results. It often means "rivalry in rendering the highest social service for the smallest return." The suggestion that Federal Government is the most favourable for Socialism is also interesting. It disposes of the common objection, that under Socialism there would be only one employer.

There are some aspects of Socialism and Social Reform which an American, writing for Americans, may be excused for passing over lightly, but which to a European are of primary importance. The problem of over-crowding is admitted by Professor Ely to be a very serious one ; but, like the Scotch preacher, he says, "My friends, let us look this difficulty boldly in the face—and pass on." He has

nothing valuable to say about it. And the influence of international rivalry on the social problem cannot be neglected by Europeans. It is the opinion of some clear thinkers, such as Professor Karl Pearson, that a less wasteful social organization will be forced on the nations of Europe, not, in the first instance, by a revolt of the proletariat, but by what he calls "extra-group competition." The nation that first intercepts the huge waste which now drains the resources of every civilized State will have a decisive economic advantage over its rivals. Analogy seems to favour the supposition that the re-organization of society will be national before it is international; and that the world will see another era of struggle between competing nations before civilization can be finally unified. If this is true, the future lies with some form of State Socialism rather than with Social Democracy; and there may be something in Herbert Spencer's theory that we are returning to the "militant type" of State. Such speculations, are, perhaps, foreign to the scope of Professor Ely's book; but it is not easy for an Englishman to put them aside when he is attempting to forecast the future of the labour movement.¹

W. R. INGE.

LE PROBLÈME FONCIER EN ANGLETERRE, mis en regard du Problème Agraire au IV^e siècle de Rome. Par JACQUES DUMAS. [337 pp. 8vo. Pedone-Lauriel. Paris, 1893.]

In recent years there has been no lack of publications dealing with the English land question. A constant stream of books, pamphlets, and magazine articles has been setting in from the most diverse quarters. Clergymen and barristers, landlords and tenants, peers and peasants—to say nothing of politicians responsible and other—have written much and spoken still more on the all-important subject. The most diverse remedies have been suggested or prescribed, from bimetallism to parish councils, from full-blown collectivism to unrestricted trade in land. Where doctors so disagree, it is interesting to turn and examine the diagnosis made by a distinguished foreigner, the secretary of the Realty Congress of 1892.

M. Dumas' work falls into two nearly equal portions. The first deals with the agrarian problem of Rome in the fourth century B.C. and with the Licinian Rogations, which M. Dumas, in opposition to the German author Niese, assigns, and apparently with good reason, to the customary date of 366 B.C., instead of to one two centuries later. The second portion is devoted to a discussion of the land question in

¹ Since the foregoing notice was set up in type, an English edition of Professor Ely's book has been published by Messrs. Swan, Sonnenschein, & Co.

England and its origin, and contains an account of English Real Property Law with its principal defects, and an indication of the direction, in which, according to M. Dumas, we are to look for a final solution. The two halves of the book, however, are not meant to be disconnected. The Roman question leads up to the English ; and it is studied, not from a purely scientific interest, to illustrate or elucidate points of the present problem, but with a practical object, to deduce a solution which, "in equal conditions," might be applied to England.

Two questions at once naturally suggest themselves : Are the Roman and English agrarian questions the same, or so far similar as to justify a conclusion being transferred from the one to the other ? Did the Licinian Laws provide a real, adequate remedy for the agricultural crisis at Rome ? Both of these queries our author is prepared to answer in the affirmative. As to the first we read (p. 167) : "Identical with the agrarian problem (*problème foncier*) of Rome in its causes, the agrarian problem of England resembles it in its effects. Here, as there, has been seen the same depopulation of the rural districts, the development of misery, the enfeeblement of the race." No doubt there are certain resemblances between the two cases. In Rome and in England, State lands (*ager publicus*) and lands subject to certain rights of common have been inclosed and have passed into private ownership, whether, as at Rome, by mere usurpation, or, as in this country, by legislative sanction, but with too frequent flagrant disregard of the commoners' rights. But this in itself is not a phenomenon peculiar to England and Rome ; if individual ownership is a development from a communistic type, it would appear to be almost universal. And what of the wide, profound differences between the two crises ? The difficulty in ancient times was largely due to the harsh law of debt, through which farmers, who had fought for Rome and had through the wars and consequent taxation been compelled to have recourse to a loan, lost or were threatened with loss of their homesteads, if not of their personal liberty. Hence one of the Licinian Laws was especially directed towards securing an alleviation for debtors. Further, the State was owner of large tracts won by the swords of the citizens, and with every conquest those tracts were extending. Where all had fought, all had a right to share in the spoil ; and discontent had arisen because the method adopted of dealing with the annexed territory grossly favoured the rich in comparison with the poor. Nor can it be said that in the first half of the fourth century B.C. the country districts had become depopulated, that the race was enfeebled, or even that *latifundia* had developed to a dangerous extent. Such facts were true two or three centuries afterwards, but not of the

times of Licinius and Sextius. Rome had more or less constantly advanced in power; her burgess-roll had expanded.; and her recent achievements, the capture of her mighty rival Veii and the rolling back of a violent tide of Gallic invasion, to be followed by still more glorious deeds in the future, were scarcely the acts of a worn-out or effete people. Whether the English race is weaker than former generations, may be left to the individual judgment to decide. On the other hand, there are potent factors in the English problem which were absent from the Roman—notably foreign competition. It is this cause, which, more than any other, has produced a paralysis of English agriculture and has intensified, if not generated, the exodus from the country to the town. It is very characteristic that M. Dumas utterly fails to assign it its due weight and importance. Otherwise he might have been led to question the accuracy of his own parallel, and to doubt the validity of arguing immediately from the Rome of Licinius to the England of to-day.

If on the one hand there is not such close similarity between the problems as to warrant the application of the same solution, so on the other hand the Land Laws of Licinius seem scarcely to merit the eulogy which M. Dumas bestows upon them. Mommsen regards them as unduly favouring the rich, by giving them “a very important and perhaps even disproportionate prior share in the produce of the domains,” and by conferring on the system of *occupatio* a kind of legal sanction. He even hints that the legislators did not act altogether honourably, but from interested motives designedly evaded a proper solution of the question of the public land. A far more effectual relief for the Roman farmers and small-holders was gained by Roman victories and by the extension of Roman sovereignty over Italy. If the Licinian Law was indeed the foundation of Roman prosperity and greatness, it is at least strange that it is not mentioned by Cicero or by any Latin author prior to Livy, that its provisions are uncertain, and the era of it disputed. Such facts prevent it from being venerated as the Magna Carta of Roman agriculture.

Although I cannot accept M. Dumas' view of the identity or close analogy between the ancient and modern problems, or acquiesce in the deduction which he would draw from ancient for modern times, yet I would acknowledge to the full the great merits of the book. M. Dumas is a jurist, and when he writes as a jurist he is admirable. His analysis of Niebuhr's account of the Licinian Rogations is excellent, and his description of some of the leading points of English Land Law is wonderfully accurate and manifests a thorough acquaintance with the subject. In his pages may be found, in a compact, interesting, and

intelligible form, a description of recent legislation and proposals relating to such matters as Public Registration of Titles, mitigation of the Right of Distraint, Tenant Right, Game Laws, Allotments and Small Holdings, Leasehold and Copyhold Enfranchisement. No better summary need be wished for. Unfortunately, he is not always a lawyer ; he is also an orator, and it is in his rhetorical passages that an exaggeration either of tone or of fact becomes apparent. He quotes from Macdonald stanzas of Shelley's frantic appeal to the men of England, as if they were equally applicable to-day and were not based on the exceptional conditions of the early part of the century. We are told that owing to the secrecy of dealings with land and to the system of private titles "alienation is infrequent, and *where it takes place* the price of sale is absorbed by the charges of solicitor and barrister" ! [The italics are mine.] Landowners are depicted as using against poaching "preventive means which are often ferocious," and by way of illustration a gentleman is quoted who for the purpose kept Danish hounds able to kill a man. Our author apparently is under the impression that such a practice is widespread, and that a poacher can be worried in England without remedy. Throughout, his tone is unduly harsh and severe towards the gentry—a class, which, in his view, consisted "of an *élite* of merchants, artisans, and rural proprietors." Their record may be black, but it is not so purely and unrelievedly black. And then comes the climax : "ancient barbarism had devised the interdiction of fire and water, modern barbarism has devised the interdiction of land." Quid plura ?

Another feature of the book, characteristic of the French mind, is the constant appeal to and employment of general abstract principles or rights. Foremost and chiefest stands the Rousseauian principle of equality, which is understood in a wide sense, and is held to include "a right to land." Armed with such a convenient, sharp-edged weapon, M. Dumas can march to attack the English land-system, and can slaughter it at will. The concentration of estates is stamped "as an odious violation of all the principles of equity." The right of property is a natural right "in the most practical sense of the word," and the exercise of it should be assured to all the members of society. Apparently, however, there is the condition attached that every one must work. If working capacity is to be the criterion, what becomes of equality ? Or, if equality is to be the rule, what becomes of equity ? Arbitrary equality is manifestly as unjust as arbitrary inequality. That the excessive accumulation of estates, and of wealth generally, in a few hands constitutes a serious menace to national well-being and stability, nearly every one would acknowledge ; but few Englishmen

would be prepared to accept M. Dumas' principle of equality. It is too vague and uncertain in its content, and in its tenor too disputable.

As to immediate reforms in Land Law, M. Dumas is in favour of the abolition of primogeniture and of the adoption of clauses, like those of the Code Napoléon, limiting the right of bequest, regarding the one as useless without the other. A system of public registration of titles is advocated, but it should be compulsory, should guarantee compensation to those whose possession is afterwards disturbed, and should be based on regular maps and surveys. The chief obstacles to such a measure are to be found in the lawyers, and in an Englishman's dislike of other people knowing his business. The disadvantages of settlements are insisted on; the successive ameliorations down to Lord Cairns' Settled Land Act of 1882 are indicated; and the complete abolition of "*ce funeste régime*" is favoured. Treating of the relations of landlord and tenant, M. Dumas would require the further restriction, if not abolition, of the Law of Distress, that "survival of the ancient right of private justice," the prolongation of the period of Notices to Quit, the extension of the principle of compensation for improvements, and a further amendment of the Game Law, "that bastard slip of the Forest Law," as Blackstone termed it.

The disappearance of distraint can hardly be contemplated without concern by one, who, like M. Dumas, is a believer in small holdings. If deprived of this right, owners would be compelled to pay more regard to the financial stability of the farmer, and would naturally prefer such as were possessed of large capital. Thus it is not improbable that the abolition of the right of seizure would lead to the increased disappearance of small holders, who could offer little or no security, and would tell in favour of the large holders and promote the development of farming on the large scale.

Undoubtedly the cardinal question, from the agricultural point of view, is that of tenant-right. By the side of this, others, such as fixity of tenure or game-preservation, sink into insignificance. At the present time it is still possible for a sitting tenant to have the rent raised upon him in consequence of his own improvements, and compensation can be claimed from the owner only for a limited, specified number of improvements. Such a condition of things is scarcely conducive to the highest cultivation of the soil. A farmer has an equitable claim to be remunerated not merely for a few, but for all and every improvement which he has effected on the estate. On the other hand, the owner has an equal right to be protected against loss due to the recklessness or incompetence of the tenant. The claims of the two parties might perhaps be best satisfied by a system of

valuation, by which the farmer would receive compensation for any extra value which he had conferred on the holding, and the landlord compensation for any depreciation inflicted upon it. Under such a régime the agriculturist would be left absolutely free and unhampered in carrying on his industry, and would not be restricted and fettered by conditions as to the use to be made of the land, such as are usually inserted in leases by owners to secure themselves against heavy loss. It is true that the farmer might still be readily given notice to quit. But this is not to be regretted in the case of an incapable tenant, and the capable one will be amply protected by the sum which he would receive under the valuation if he had to leave his farm. Thus the advantages of fixity of tenure would be obtained without the disadvantages that would result from the difficulty of getting rid of an incompetent farmer. No hardship is imposed on either of the contracting parties. Tenant-right was once declared by a famous statesman to be landlord's wrong. History shows that landlord's right has been tenant's wrong. A healthy system would be neither the one nor the other.

Such reforms, however, would appear mere palliatives to M. Dumas. He is a Socialist; his book has a socialistic flavour throughout; and he would end in a nationalization or municipalization of the land. He would, however, avoid the eager, mistaken haste of the "dogmatic Socialists," and would move slowly, not anticipating what he regards as the course of evolution. The owners are not to be simply evicted, but are to be bought out. Carrying out his principle of *droit à la terre*, his ideal would seem to be a multitude of allotments or small holdings, the ownership of which would lie in the community. It is an entrancing picture to imagine every one seated "under his own vine and fig-tree." Man, however, cannot live of clods of earth, but only of the produce thereof; and the spectre of foreign competition at once arises to disturb our dream, though it does not trouble that of M. Dumas. Can the holder of a few acres grow wheat at 23s. 9d. a quarter, the figure at which it has been selling during the past month or so? Can he compete with the more efficient production of the extensive farmer with his improved machinery? Will the artisan classes consent to the imposition of heavy protective duties on agricultural produce, such as in France afford a struggling livelihood to the small proprietors? It may be that M. Dumas regards England as capable of supporting her own population; for he condemns the existing land system as utterly hostile to production, and quotes an astonishing estimate that the soil does not give forth more than a fifth of its normal yield. Happy normal yield! And yet, according to the

Agricultural Returns, even under the present baneful régime, the average yield per acre is higher in England than in any other country of the world. Doubtless, it might still be increased, and will be increased with improved methods of cultivation. But authorities are agreed that England, with her huge population, cannot hope to be self-supporting. Foreign importation is a necessity; and if it remains free, allotments and small holdings are likely to succeed only in exceptionally favourable situations, such as the neighbourhood of a large town, or as garden ground. They are no universal panacea.

It had been my intention to say something with regard to the Unearned Increment theory, and to the absolute distinction which M. Dumas draws between land and other forms of property (which leads him to apply and confine nationalization to the soil only), but space forbids. It may, however, be remarked that Thorold Rogers is strangely quoted in the same breath as J. S. Mill as one of the great pillars of the Unearned Increment faith. In reality, he opposed Mill's doctrine and maintained its unsoundness,¹ as depending on a theory of rent which was more than questionable.

M. Dumas' work contains on every page evidence of his deep interest and sympathy in his subject. It is preceded by a critical preface, written by M. Yves Guyot, who deals with the problem in quite a different way, and who regards progress as consisting in the development of the individual, and in freeing him from his ties to the land and from other bonds. He objects to M. Dumas' proposals as tending to restore old servitudes and bind men to the soil. With regard to the *droit à la terre*, he has some remarks which deserve to be quoted. "It is not land that is wanting to man, but power to make use of it; and the more precautions you take to secure him the right to land, the less effort will he make to utilize it. From the democratic point of view, your intentions will end in the same result as the aristocratic institutions which you criticize so justly."

G. W. POWERS.

THE JOINT STANDARD: A Plain Exposition of Monetary Principles and of the Monetary Controversy. By ELIJAH HELM. [xv., 221 pp. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net. Macmillan. London, 1894.]

Mr. Helm intends his book as "a manual dealing concisely with the subject" of bimetallism "in the light both of economic teaching and practical business life." He has had, as he tells us, "the advantage of combining a systematic study of economics with

¹ Cf. *Economic Interpretation of History*, chap. xi.

a somewhat long commercial experience," and he has, if he will allow us to say so, preserved unimpaired an original faculty for writing good English which is apt to deteriorate under the corrupting influence of long-continued business correspondence. His manual is consequently pleasant reading, but it is not very likely to fulfil its purpose of making many converts to bimetallism. It contains two novelties, neither of which are very happy creations. One is the bold advocacy of the plan of paying off the Indian rupee 4 per cent. debt by means of a 3 per cent. gold loan. Mr. Helm shows that there would be a saving on this operation unless the rupee fell below 10½d., but he seems to have overlooked the fact that, when he was writing, the 4 per cent. rupee debt was on the eve of being converted into 3½ per cent. rupee debt without any risk at all. The conversion has since been taken in hand, and it reduces the possible savings to be obtained by adopting his plan to exactly one-half of the sum he mentions. This amount is certainly not sufficient compensation for the extra risk involved. The Indian Government has already staked quite enough on the success of the currency scheme. The other novelty is a curious dissertation on the burden of taxation in England, the object of which is apparently to prove that appreciation of gold has somehow increased the amount of taxes levied when reckoned in commodities other than gold. But surely the amount of the taxes depends on the amount of the national expenditure. The expenses of government must be defrayed somehow, and whether the amount collected in taxes, measured in commodities other than gold, increases by appreciation of gold or by the increase of old taxes and the imposition of new ones, is a question of the distribution of taxes, not of the aggregate burden of taxation. This fundamental vice in Mr. Helm's contention makes it unnecessary to carry criticism into details, but it may be well to point out that, when he says that the taxes paid in respect of a purely arable farm of two hundred acres would be about the same now as in 1867-77, he apparently forgets that the rent, and, consequently, the assessment both for income-tax (Schedules A and B) and for local rates would be much less.

Generally speaking, Mr. Helm follows the ordinary bimetallist lines, and, as it appears to the anti-bimetallist critic, falls into the usual errors. He has scarcely started before he tumbles headlong into the metaphorical gold and silver reservoirs. If two reservoirs, he says, are connected by a pipe at the bottom, the level of the water in them "will not be that which either reservoir would have had if the two had not been thus joined." (As a matter of fact, it will be so very often when the overflow level is reached, but let this pass.) "It will

be a mean, and although this will be subject to a certain rise and fall, the changes will not be so great in either reservoir as they would have been if each had been subject to the constant variations of rainfall and offtake affecting itself alone." If this were true it would not prove anything about bimetallism, and it is not true. It is, or ought to be, obvious that if, owing to the variations of inflow and outflow being more coincident, one of the two reservoirs was subject to less variation of level than the other, the level in the two reservoirs when connected might vary more than the level in that reservoir when unconnected, though it would vary less than the level in the other reservoir.

In the attempt to show that, if bimetallism were now adopted by the United States and the great European powers, it would not come to an end in the same way as the bimetallism of the Latin Union came to an end in 1873, Mr. Helm is no more successful than his predecessors. Mr. Bagehot, he says, believed, in July 1876, that the Latin Union, if it had been willing, could have supplied Germany with the gold she required, and taken in exchange all her "cast-off" silver. This is likely enough, but Mr. Helm does not say whether any one believes, in 1894, that the bimetallism of the Latin Union at the ratio of 15½ to 1 could have long continued to withstand the disproportionate increase of the silver production if the Union had been ever so willing to take gold in exchange for silver. Nor does he give us the slightest reason to suppose that the same reasons which made the Latin Union unwilling to substitute silver for gold in 1873 would not make the Americo-European Bimetallic Alliance of the future unwilling to substitute silver for gold at some future period under approximately similar circumstances. There are three possibilities with regard to the future production of gold and silver :—

1. They may be produced in such qualities that their relative value, in the absence of bimetallism, will remain (with slight and temporary fluctuations) the same as it is at present.

2. They may be produced in such quantities that, in the absence of bimetallism, gold will fall in relation to silver.

3. They may be produced in such quantities that, in the absence of bimetallism, silver will fall still further in relation to gold.

If those who prophesy case 1 are correct, bimetallism at the present market ratio would probably work well enough and last indefinitely. If those who prophesy case 2 are correct, bimetallism would probably continue to exist in name for an indefinite period, though it would gradually cease to exist in substance, as gold coins would supersede silver standard coins in the larger payments, and eventually silver token

coins would probably be superseded by token coins made of baser metal. In both of these cases it is true that the adoption of bimetallism would get rid of the difficulties which fluctuation of the exchange creates in trade between gold-and-silver-using countries, but Mr. Helm admits frankly that these difficulties are exaggerated. By certain financial arrangements, which he explains in a perspicuous manner on pp. 135-137, "in a very great degree, the purely mercantile derangement and loss occasioned by the monetary dislocation have been eliminated in the trade between gold and silver standard countries." As to the other evil which bimetallism seeks to remedy—the fall of prices in gold-standard countries—it is clear that, in case 1, it would have no effect at all, and that in case 2 it would make prices lower than they would be under a purely gold standard. If, finally, those who believe in case 3 are right, "the equilibratory action" of the bimetallic system must necessarily lead to the substitution of silver money for gold money somewhere, and the question is, Where? There was a time when bimetallists believed that the substitution would take place in the pockets of the people, but the experience of the American silver dollar has effectually dispelled that belief, and now Professor Foxwell relies on the two institutions where the *auri sacra fames* reigns stronger than anywhere else, the great banks and government war-chests. Mr. Helm ignores the difficulty. With Professor Foxwell he promises that we private persons shall not be obliged to take silver, but he does not make it clear who is to take it. He gives an imaginary Bank of England Issue Department return, in which £5,000,000 of silver is held in addition to gold against notes issued. Considering the amounts of silver in the United States Treasury and in the Bank of France, is it reasonable to suppose that, even only six months after the establishment of bimetallism, £5,000,000 of silver would be all that would have found its way to London? And how much would there be after six years? Is the taking off of a beggarly £5,000,000 all that continental bimetallists and American "silver senators" expect of this country? It is worth noting that Mr. Helm's £5,000,000 of silver appears in his return, not in substitution for £5,000,000 of gold, but in addition to the gold held before, the amount of notes issued being increased from £45,000,000 to £50,000,000. Why should the establishment of bimetallism bring about the increase? At present I carry in my pocket one five-pound note. What is there in bimetallism which should make every nine similar persons carry ten five-pound notes instead of nine as at present?

It is much to be wished that bimetallist writers would go a little more into detail as to the probable working of bimetallism in various

contingencies, instead of filling so much space with familiar quotations from "authorities." Owing partly to bimetallist writing, but much more to American experiments, the subject is so much better understood now than it was a few years ago, that it really matters very little what Mr. Bagehot said in 1876, what Professor Thorold Rogers said in 1879, or even what the Gold and Silver Commission said in 1888. One of the most telling of the stock bimetallist quotations, which duly finds its place in Mr. Helm's book, is Mr. Ernest Seyd's prophecy of a depression of trade. Yet this same "authority" also prophesied that long before silver fell to its present price the English silver token coinage would become depreciated.

EDWIN CANNAN.

INFLUENZA RECIPROCA TRA MOVIMENTO OPERAIO PRODUZIONE E RICCHEZZA. By PIER FRANCESCO CASARETTO. [482 pp. 8vo. Roux. Rome, 1893.]

The aim of this book is to vindicate the "labour movement" in the eyes of the employer and the capitalist. The main argument is that the rise of wages is a necessary condition of industrial progress. Sr. Casaretto goes rapidly through the history of agriculture,¹ manufactures, and mining (with the help of authorities, among whom "il Jeans," "il Giffen," "il Mulhall" are conspicuous), to prove that every increase of wages has more than paid for itself in the increase of production and demand. He does not exactly formulate his principle as our familiar "high wages and low cost of production," but his argument tends the same way. And he expressly puts the rise of wages as cause, not effect. Employers would not exert themselves to improve machinery and economize processes, if the organized labourers were not continually forcing their hand. It is a fallacy to urge that wages must rise anyhow, and workmen would do well to wait for the rise to come of itself, because, although the large forces are acting ultimately in that direction, their action can be powerfully hastened by the conscious efforts of individuals. When the great industrial development began, the largest capitalists got the benefit of it, then the middle classes, then the skilled workmen, finally the unskilled labourers came in; and this is to happen more emphatically in the future. And the same gradation is to be seen in the progress of different countries; the poorest countries began to raise their wages the latest, but of late years they have been rising the fastest, and they will go on till they are somewhere near the level of England and America. Sr. Casaretto acknowledges that the process is not always so beneficent in the

¹ With no reference to diminishing returns or to English agricultural depression.

history of the individual, and has many words of compassion for the "victims of the victory." He compares the temporarily displaced workmen to the wounded in war, and expects a kind of "Geneva convention" in their favour from the general growth of social sentiment. He suggests, for instance, that the sailors who profit by steam-cranes might subscribe to indemnify the dockers who are thrown out of work by them (apparently this is a burning question in Italy); and, in the same way, the colliers might indemnify the iron-workers if the rise in coal closes any iron-works. As workmen become better off they will be better educated, more mobile, and more versatile, and these temporary crises will diminish.

T. C. SNOW.

THE UNEMPLOYED. By GEOFFREY DRAGE, Secretary to the Labour Commission. [xii., 277 pp. 8vo. 3s. 6d. net. Macmillan. London, 1894.]

One very honourable quality has characterized all English economic writings of any importance for two generations at least—an entire absence of the kind of rancour which savours of a personal character. The interests of reform can doubtless sometimes be promoted by ridiculing the style and arrangement of a blue book, or even by suggesting that its author is incompetent and overpaid. No one would more resent a restriction of liberty in this direction than the present writer. But before Mr. Drage printed a virulent attack upon the Chief Commissioner for Labour and his *Report on Agencies and Methods for dealing with the Unemployed*, he should have reflected whether the relation of the staff of the Labour Commission to the Labour Department of the Board of Trade and the relation of his book to the *Report* were not such as to make it extremely unlikely that this attack would in any way advance the cause of reform. Owing to certain suggestions which appeared in the newspapers two or three years ago, there is a widespread belief, which may be well or ill founded, that the staff of the Labour Commission must have been somewhat disappointed when the reorganization of the Labour Department of the Board of Trade made it clear that they were to be disbanded like the staff of any other temporary commission. It should, therefore, have occurred to Mr. Drage that his motives in making a vigorous attack upon the new Chief Commissioner for Labour, however pure they might be, were certain to be misconstrued. It is quite clear, too, that, if the Labour Department's *Report* had never been published, or if it had been the work of a private individual, Mr. Drage could not have written the book now before us. The body

of it contains 233 printed pages, and in 105 of them, which constitute Part II., Mr. Drage says himself (see p. 44) that he has "merely rearranged the information contained in the Board of Trade *Report*, with supplementary footnotes," and a less partial critic would probably say that he had extracted a small amount of the information, and added a few references to the publications of the Labour Commission. The other three Parts of the book consist almost entirely of criticism of the *Report* and remarks suggested by it. To utilize a report in this way, and then to denounce its editor as "incompetent" (p. x.) and as "well paid" (p. xi.) is, to say the least of it, decidedly injudicious. No one will attend to Mr. Drage's precept when, by his example, he has shown so high an appreciation of the value of the Chief Commissioner's work.

The keynote of Mr. Drage's own contribution to the literature of the subject is careful and elaborate distinction between the different classes of unemployed, and between the various causes of want of employment, or, as he prefers to call it, influenced perhaps by a phrase of Mr. Charles Booth's which he ridicules, "superfluity of labour." After dealing with questions of classification at some length, he arrives at the conclusion that the "problem" is fivefold. It requires—

(1) The elimination of the existing "stock" of temporarily unemployed.

(2) The elimination of the existing "stock" of permanently unemployed.

(3) The prevention of persons being thrown temporarily out of work in the future.

(4) The prevention of persons being thrown permanently out of work in the future.

(5) Better organization of industry so as to assist the circulation of labour in accordance with the demand for it.

For the attainment of the first of these requirements he recommends voluntary relief works, locally managed, but supervised by a central body so as to prevent undesirable migration. For the second requirement he favours labour colonies in addition to the poor-law and existing charitable and religious agencies. In regard to the third and fourth requirements, he trusts to indirect measures, such as educational and sanitary reforms, and, in order to secure the fifth, he wishes the trade unions jointly to establish a national central labour bureau, which should endeavour to adjust the supply of labour as a whole to the demand for it. His most immediate practical object seems to be to advocate the establishment of a special group of experts which, "with the aid of a competent staff, should be acquainted with the exact

extent and nature of the distress at any time in the United Kingdom, and with the attempts to deal with the problem both at home and abroad. Only thus," he says, "would it be fully competent to form a correct judgment of the problem as a whole. Thus equipped, however, it would be able to discriminate between those sections of the problem that can best be solved by the action of the poor-law, charitable, and other agencies, and that section of the problem with which no existing agency is calculated to deal satisfactorily, and which it can, therefore, itself wisely undertake to manage. This would include the establishment of temporary relief works, labour colonies, and a network of labour bureaux. While such a body would itself deal only with the existing 'stock' of unemployed, it would be capable of conducting a wise agitation for the whole series of lesser remedies for preventing the recurrence of the problem" (p. 239).

EDWIN CANNAN.

GUERRA AL PREGIUDIZIO. (Bassorilievo della società Italiana). Applicazione sociologica. By LUIGI DE BELLIS. [428 pp. 8vo. 5 francs. Ricci. Chieti, 1894.]

The causes of Italian misery are "prejudices." "Prejudice" is the state of mind of clericalists, and socialists, and anarchists, and contemporary Italians generally; they all think too much of their rights and too little of their duties, and prefer professions and manufactures to agriculture, and object to paying taxes, and neglect the study of Herbert Spencer. This last particular comes first, and nearly half the book is occupied with a summary of the synthetic philosophy. Mr. Spencer is a great man, and it would be unfair to hold him responsible for the cheap omniscience of all his disciples; but they are a weary folk! When Sr. De Bellis gets away from "eterogeneità coerente" and "omogeneità incoerente" and comes to the actual state of Italy, he is much more interesting than his portentous beginnings. His hopes for the future are chiefly in the improvement of character; but he is not very sanguine. Unless all his remedies are applied very soon, the socialists and anarchists will have their way (he thinks that in practice they would come to the same thing, although their theories differ); and there will be a political and economic break-down, with a reconstruction after centuries of suffering. His remedies are chiefly moral and educational; everybody is to be taught all the proper morals, and a natural religion free from clericalism, and people are to be content not to struggle for pleasure and social advancement. But there are many detailed suggestions. The Senate is to be abolished, and its powers given to an enlarged Council of State. The Chamber

is to be elected by an electoral college, from a limited list of qualified candidates. The State is to sell the railways to private shareholders. No public official is to have a higher salary than twelve thousand lire. There is to be a permanent progressive income-tax, ranging from 1 to 75 per cent. (but in every income the higher rates only apply to the higher portions); and for the present crisis a bread-tax of two centimes per kilogramme. To begin with, the holdings of agricultural land are to be limited to one hundred hectares (with compensation to the present landowners), and the holders are to be encouraged to co-operate until all farming is co-operative. The army and navy are to be kept up to the utmost requirements of the Triple Alliance, but the officers are to be trained to look forward to their own extinction in happier days. The author's economics are a little incoherent. When society is to be reformed, everybody is to give up the desire for luxuries, but when the socialists denounce luxury, it "gives employment to labour." In the same way, nobody ought to object to the military taxation, because it supports Italian soldiers and artisans; but it is one of the author's perpetual laments that so much labour is diverted from agriculture. Following the author's lead, we have put truth before all things; otherwise, it would be singularly ungrateful to disparage a book that has nothing but good to say of England. "I sintomi intellettivi, divenuti coscienza, sono arrivati a darci Mosè, Socrate, Platone, Aristotile, Cristo, Bacone, Kant e Spencer." The very first sentence of the book invites us to "trace with lightning speed the path of humanity," "dalla prima espressione articolata al pensiero geniale di Gladstone o di Bismarck."

T. C. SNOW.

DIE GEWERBLICHEN PRODUKTIV-GENOSSENSCHAFTEN. By DR. H. HÄNTSCHKE. [350 pp. 6 marks. Gertz. Charlottenburg, 1894.]

Co-operative production evidently is by no means the discredited chimera for which some of our Manchester co-operators give it out. On the contrary, wherever the principles of co-operation have been fully mastered, there the eyes of philanthropists are anxiously turned to it, as to the sole institution from which improvement, alike abiding and adequate, is likely to come. The problem has as yet been only partially solved. In Germany, as elsewhere, there are difficulties to be overcome, there have been discouraging failures. Of 322 productive co-operative associations known to have been formed since 1864, Dr. Häntschke shows that no fewer than 213 have failed, or else have deserted co-operative principles. And of the number surviving, the

majority are either co-operative or else productive only in name. Thirty-one are bakeries or flour-mills ; seven are associations of owners of houses licensed in perpetuity to brew beer ; eighteen are distillers—likewise, in truth, joint-stock companies, for the prosecution of a remunerative trade. There are printers' associations with not a single printer in them. But, on the other hand, there are a small number of excellently organized, and excellently managed, truly co-operative societies. There is, for instance, the little Association of Shipbuilders and Ships' Carpenters of Memel. There is the Cigar Makers' Association of Hamburgh, comprising above thirteen hundred members (not all of them workers) and doing a large business, on a capital raised by shares of only 25s. apiece. There are the co-operative printing works of Breslau and Hanover, the former numbering 112 members, the latter 134. There is the Weavers' Association of Lübbecke in Westphalia. And there are more. One success, rightly urges Dr. Häntschke, proves more in respect of the practicability of co-operative production, than a hundred failures. And such examples as those cited make it indisputably clear that co-operative production may be safely and successfully practised. Indeed, our author sees no reason whatever to recede from the hopeful view taken by his great master, Schulze-Delitzsch, to the effect that productive co-operation is the only *fully* co-operative form of association yet conceived, inasmuch as it alone fully realizes the aims with which co-operation is taken up. The other forms of co-operation he will look upon merely as auxiliary services, rungs of the ladder which lead up to production. It may be interesting to note that Germany at present possesses 109 co-operative productive associations, only 100 of which have been registered under the co-operative law. Of the 109, 34 are *bonâ fide* working-men's associations ; 42 employers', 31 bakeries and flour-mills, that is,—rather supply associations than productive ; and 2 philanthropic institutions. Of the hundred, 53 work under limited liability, 47 under unlimited. Grouped according to trades, 4 are joiners' associations, 2 manufacture textile fabrics, 3 consist of tailors, 10 of printers, 1 of metal workers, 1 of cigar-makers, 5 of builders, 1 of shoemakers, 2 of potters, 1 of gilders, 31 are bakeries and flour-mills, 7 breweries, 18 distilleries, 4 syrup factories, and 7 are unclassified. Our author is not quite up to date in some information which he gives with respect to foreign countries. In England he has not gone to quite the right shop for information on *productive* associations. In respect of Italy he omits to mention some of the most distinctively co-operative enterprises. In respect of France, he gives the number of *associations ouvrières* as 52, whereas in last June it stood at 70. And he is incorrect in stating that

these associations take *no* subsidy from the State. In respect of his own country, however, his information bears every evidence of being exact, as, indeed, in view of his position as one of the secretaries of the Central Union of German Co-operative Associations formed under the Schulze-Delitzsch rules, it ought to be.

HENRY W. WOLFF.

THE ETHICS OF CITIZENSHIP. By JOHN MACCUNN, M.A.,
Professor of Philosophy in University College, Liverpool.
[223 pp. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. Maclehose. Glasgow, 1894.]

This work rises very much above the mass of the semi-popular, semi-philosophical literature which has been called into existence by University Extension, the advance of democracy, and the wide diffusion of an absorbing interest in social problems. It claims a place, if a modest place, in the literature of political thought—not in the category of *biblia abiblia*, to which Charles Lamb would assuredly have assigned a large percentage of the “Manuals” and the like of the present day. Perhaps we can best indicate the nature of these pages by saying that they form a book of civic sermons. They read like lectures rather than essays, and must, it may be presumed, have been delivered somewhere. They might have been delivered in church; we sincerely wish they had been so. They are thoughtful, eloquent, at times even brilliant; and form a worthy commentary, adapted to the needs of our time, upon the excellently chosen extracts from the greatest classics of political thought which form one of their most agreeable features. Here are the titles of the chapters: The Equality of Man, Fraternity, The Rights of Man, Citizenship, The Rule of the Majority in Politics, Party and Political Consistency, Elements of Political Consistency, Some Economic and Moral Aspects of Luxury.

Professor Maccunn's point of view is that of an ardent believer in Democracy, who has the keenest possible sense of all those spiritual interests which will be endangered if Democracy should take the direction which some men hope, and many fear: he is a democrat emancipated from the fetishes and fanaticisms of Democracy; a democrat who is not a Materialist, or a Revolutionist, or a Philistine, or a leveller, or even—though he fully sympathizes with an extension of State action—a Collectivist. His tone is that of a sober optimism. His book might be described as a philosophical justification, not of things as they are, but of things as—in his view—they are slowly but surely tending to be.

Perhaps the best chapter in the book is the one on “Democracy and

Character." It is a sort of reply to Mill's gloomy anticipations as to the extinction of individuality. It is satisfactory to be reassured by one who is able to depict the danger as vividly as is done in the following paragraphs :—

"Great influences made common are like the common sunshine and shower, which make all things grow after their kind. Rightly used, they quicken the secret seeds of individual vitality. Else were the popularizing of the very Gospel itself a barren sowing of the sand. But there is a risk which has to be faced. The best and greatest things on earth, in being popularized, may be plebified. The golden coin may become the brass counter, the watchword the catchword, the precept the platitude, the creed the cant. In political programme, in popular lecture, in ethical or religious address, the message received is not the message sent. Popular information is mistaken for education, and acquaintance with the current commonplaces of literary or scientific hearsay for a knowledge of literature."

And, after all, Professor Maccunn has a good deal to say for the cheerful tone with which he confronts "this mighty tide, that, with the ocean of Democracy behind it, sets towards the mud-flat shores of Uniformity."

The chapter on "The Rule of the Majority in Politics" is an interesting attempt to find a philosophic justification for the omnipotence of bare majorities. It may be described as an apologia for the average man; and here it seems to me rather to miss the mark. Granted that the average man is fit to form an opinion on the political and social questions submitted to him, is that any reason why one-half of the community should lie at the mercy of the odd average man who may chance to constitute a majority for the odd member of Parliament who constitutes a majority at a particular division? Professor Maccunn hardly seems to recognize that there are highly democratical constitutions which provide remedies against such a state of things.

The least satisfactory chapter in the book is the one which deals with luxury. "To prefer the luxuries that are durable to those that are perishable" is surely a very disputable maxim. It may enable the moralist to commend great pictures and deprecate big dinners; but it would seem also to encourage some of the most senseless forms of luxury—the erection of obelisks or useless buildings, the accumulation of jewellery and the like—and to condemn the concert and the theatre. To deprecate asceticism and talk of a "more spiritual morality, which sees in luxuries, if only they be well and rightly used, the instruments of moral and intellectual development" is not

particularly helpful to any one who really wants to know his duty in this matter. It is quite easy to spend £10,000 a year in graceful, cultivated, refined, intellectual, and intrinsically harmless ways. But what if somebody has to live on 10s. a week in consequence of my wanting so many "instruments of moral and spiritual development?"

H. RASHDALL.

TOWARDS UTOPIA : Being Speculations in Social Evolution. By A FREE LANCE. [vi., 252, pp. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. Sonnenschein. London, 1894.]

"To our thinking, Utopia can be reached only after a long journey thro (*sic*) semi-Utopia. It will be found; that our chief concern lies with this semi-Utopia." This is the author's chief purpose to suggest what a Utopian Bacon might call the *anorthomata media*, the practical instalments of reform which are possible in the immediate present, but always with an eye to the Utopian future. So he describes his programme, but most of us would say that his "temporary" and "provisional" is something very much like the "ultimate" of our wildest dreams. What is the first step? This, that everybody is to be honest, so honest that there are no police, no lawyers, no soldiers,—nay, no tickets on the railways, for everybody puts the proper fare into a box, and no cabdrivers (except in the most crowded streets), for everybody can be trusted to drive off in a cab and send it back again to the stand, the horse finding its own way. (Apparently every man can drive a horse by the light of nature; for we read in another passage that coachmen are required, "not for use, but to meet the ridiculous demands of an extravagant fashion."¹) It is not quite fair, but controversially it is an irresistible temptation, to take the author as meaning that all this honesty can be established to-morrow morning; he does make a certain allowance for the gradualness of things: on the other hand, it is simply his own assertion that universal honesty is only an instalment; "by hypothesis, in our semi-Utopia there are no thieves" (p. 85). What more has Utopia to offer?

How is the universal honesty to be reached? And generally, how is the state of Utopia in semi-Utopia to be brought about? Only by moral suasion and voluntary action. "We hope that all this will not be understood as an advocacy of socialistic doctrines, for although it appears to us that the *final* social state contemplated by ourselves is

¹ Page 82. The author's words refer to what he calls "a beliveried, befurred, bebigbuttoned, live figurehead." But his argument includes "coachmen as such, coachmen pure and simple," and, in the same passage, he says that "men will prefer to drive themselves."

not very vitally different from that which the Socialists aim at, yet our respective prescriptions for arriving at such state, and for maintaining it when arrived at, are *fundamentally different*" (p. 221). "We not only do not contemplate the 'appropriation' (anglicé, *robbery*—if the communists, who do not think it robbery, will pardon us) of these large private gardens for more general use, but we do not even look to the municipal buying up of open spaces as the machinery for securing 'central parks : ' on the contrary, we look merely to the action of private unselfish impulse and private enterprise. Once succede (*sic*) in infecting people with this feeling, and all will come easy : those fortunate possessors of large gardens will give their friends and neighbors (*sic*) the run of them" (p. 81). And so with all the other items of the author's programme, disappearance of useless work, shortened hours of labour, equality of social consideration, universal smallness of families ; a whole people is to be converted to a new ideal, and yet scrupulously to abstain from the readiest means of carrying its ideal into effect. In the study, "general feeling" can be kept separate from "collective action ;" but in practical social life "everybody ought" is only the subjective side of "everybody must."

The most characteristic, the best thought out, and in every way the most valuable part of the book is the discussion of domestic service, with the allied subject of the social status of different kinds of labour. "The ordinary Briton . . . without any compunction he condemns young girls to blacklead the grates and wash the hearthstone and doorsteps at terrible cost to their hands ; but what would he say of the youngster who should lie snugly in bed while his own sister was washing a doorstep on a bitter morning ? He would probably say that flogging were too gentle a treatment for such a mean-spirited cur. Yet, pray, is not our housemaid also somebody's sister ?" If that was all, one might accuse the author of an unpractical sentimentalism, but he does not content himself with indignation at the cleaning of doorsteps ; he shows us how it can be abolished. "White hearthstones and white doorsteps are also *doomed—as everything entailing useless work, work producing neither pleasure nor profit, is doomed* in a better social state." And in the same way, new kinds of warming are to do away with the housemaid's obligation to "prowl around with ashes, cinders, and blacklead-pots-and-brushes, to the no small detriment of her hands."¹ "It is—we presume—not known who was

¹ The author cannot keep the hands out of his memorial. Even when he is pleading for the delights of engine-driving and farming and the like, he cannot leave out the qualification, "putting aside the trouble of roughening and staining the hands, which we admit is a *bonâ fide* sore trouble to us."

the miserable idiot that first introduced the dirty and objectionable practice of covering our boots with blacking; but any one who likes to dip into the future may satisfy himself that the boots for future wear will be either of patent leather or brown, or at anyrate (*sic*) something other than blacking." In short, "our object is simply to show how readily the quantity of household work, and consequently the need for servants, may be diminished, and also how the quality of it—by the deletion of unsavoury portions—may be so improved that there may be nothing left in household service repugnant to the feelings of a refined and tolerably educated girl."

I have put the domestic details first, as the best example of the author's union of passionate chivalry with practical ingenuity. If they seem grotesque in quotation, they are not grotesque in the book; they are precious to anybody who has really thought about the question. But the interest of his scheme for domestic service does not rest in the details. He expects it to transform itself under the operation of several distinct causes: (1) the spread of a taste for simplicity of life, making people demand less service; (2) the rise of wages, making it impossible to get service in the present quantities; (3) the attraction into domestic service, by the raised wages, of women with a higher standard of living, who will demand separate sitting-rooms and pleasant bedrooms (these are among his great points of reform); (4) the voluntary limitation of all families to two or three children, and the consequent possibility of uniting three or four families into a single house, with common servants and common teachers (he refers to another book for his scheme for the multiplication of teachers). He is not in favour of the absorption of the servant into the served family as a temporary daughter,—the "help" system; he provides his future servant with a separate sitting-room, and free evenings, spent in going out or receiving visitors, and never once notices the obvious objection that most of us would raise in the servant's own interest. Perhaps he puts it all down to "Mrs. Grundy," but more probably it has never once occurred to him; it is not his way to leave out anything that he has ever thought of.

The next most important part of the book is the author's passionate plea for simplicity of life. It is rather a relative simplicity. "In the name of all commonsense, what reasonable enjoyments could any man not get for £2-3000 per year?" and in another passage the normal way of life is assumed to be the possession of two or three servants. The simplicity is expected to come in two ways, because people will be persuaded to believe in it (by this book, let us hope), and because rents and profits, and the payments of middlemen and

